

# **APPENDIX III**

## **TAB G**

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

1 (Pages 1 to 4)

<p>1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT</p> <p>2 FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA</p> <p>3 -----X</p> <p>4 TAMMY KITZMILLER, et al., :</p> <p>5 Plaintiffs, : Case No.:</p> <p>6 vs. : 04-CV-2688</p> <p>7 DOVER AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT AND :</p> <p>8 DOVER AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT : (Hon. Judge Jones)</p> <p>9 BOARD OF DIRECTORS, :</p> <p>10 Defendants. :</p> <p>11 -----X</p> <p>12</p> <p>13 Deposition of JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.,</p> <p>14 Washington, D.C.,</p> <p>15 Wednesday, June 1, 2005</p> <p>16 9:05 A.M.</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19 Job No.: 1-55231</p> <p>20 Pages: 1 - 297</p> <p>21 Reported by: Dana R. Craddock, RPR</p> <p>22</p>	<p>1 APPEARANCES</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 ON BEHALF OF THE PLAINTIFFS:</p> <p>4 ALFRED H. WILCOX, Esquire</p> <p>5 Pepper Hamilton, LLP</p> <p>6 3000 Two Logan Square</p> <p>7 Eighteenth and Arch Streets</p> <p>8 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103-2799</p> <p>9 Telephone: (215) 981-4000</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p> <p>12 ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANTS:</p> <p>13 RICHARD THOMPSON, Esquire</p> <p>14 Thomas More Law Center</p> <p>15 24 Frank Lloyd Wright Drive</p> <p>16 P.O. Box 393</p> <p>17 Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106</p> <p>18 Telephone: (734) 827-2001</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p>
<p>1 Deposition of JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D., held</p> <p>2 at the offices of:</p> <p>3</p> <p>4 Pepper Hamilton, LLP</p> <p>5 600 14th Street, Northwest</p> <p>6 Hamilton Square</p> <p>7 Washington, D.C. 20005</p> <p>8 (202) 220-1200</p> <p>9</p> <p>10 Pursuant to agreement, before Dana R.</p> <p>11 Craddock, RPR, Court Reporter and Notary Public in and</p> <p>12 for the District of Columbia.</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p>	<p>1 CONTENTS</p> <p>2 EXAMINATION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.: PAGE:</p> <p>3 By Mr. Thompson 5</p> <p>4</p> <p>5</p> <p>6</p> <p>7 EXHIBITS</p> <p>8 DEFENDANTS DEPOSITION EXHIBIT PAGE</p> <p>9 No. 1 Curriculum Vitae 9</p> <p>10 No. 2 Report Of John F. Haught, Ph.D. 24</p> <p>11 No. 3 Dover Area Board Of Directors, 32</p> <p>12 Biology Curriculum Press Release</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005.

2 (Pages 5 to 8)

<p>1 PROCEEDINGS</p> <p>2 JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.,</p> <p>3 having been sworn, testified as follows:</p> <p>4 EXAMINATION BY COUNSEL FOR THE DEFENDANTS</p> <p>5 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>6 Q Good morning, Professor Haught. As you</p> <p>7 know, my name is Richard Thompson, and we've met</p> <p>8 previously, and I would like to ask if you've ever</p> <p>9 been deposed before in a court case.</p> <p>10 A No, this is my first time.</p> <p>11 Q Okay. And you've just been sworn to tell</p> <p>12 the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth?</p> <p>13 A Yes.</p> <p>14 Q You understand the meaning of that oath?</p> <p>15 A Yes.</p> <p>16 Q It's the same as if you were in a</p> <p>17 courtroom --</p> <p>18 A Yes.</p> <p>19 Q -- in front of a judge. Because of the</p> <p>20 importance of telling the truth, the whole truth and</p> <p>21 nothing but the truth, I would like you to just follow</p> <p>22 a few rules I think that are basically common to all</p>	<p>1 sure we will take periodic breaks anyway, but if you</p> <p>2 need to take a break, please first finish the</p> <p>3 question -- answering the question, and then we can</p> <p>4 take the break then.</p> <p>5 Are you taking any kind of medication or</p> <p>6 drugs that would in any way detract from your ability</p> <p>7 to understand the questions?</p> <p>8 A No.</p> <p>9 Q Okay. Is there any reason that you can</p> <p>10 think of that you will not be able to truthfully</p> <p>11 answer the questions?</p> <p>12 A No.</p> <p>13 Q Okay. So if you answer a question that I</p> <p>14 ask, then I will assume that you've heard the question</p> <p>15 and understood it; is that correct?</p> <p>16 A Yes.</p> <p>17 MR. WILCOX: Objection. He might not</p> <p>18 have understood it the way you understood it.</p> <p>19 MR. THOMPSON: Right.</p> <p>20 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>21 Q During the deposition your counsel will</p> <p>22 object, and that is for the Record, and normally you</p>
<p>1 depositions. And that is, you have to speak orally;</p> <p>2 you can't shrug or nod your head because the court</p> <p>3 reporter cannot take down a shrug or a nod of the</p> <p>4 head; that if you don't understand a question that I</p> <p>5 ask you or don't hear it, please ask me to repeat the</p> <p>6 question or rephrase it and I will try my best to do</p> <p>7 that. Do you understand that?</p> <p>8 A Yes.</p> <p>9 Q You understand that the deposition is a way</p> <p>10 of the defendants finding out the basis of your expert</p> <p>11 opinion?</p> <p>12 A Yes.</p> <p>13 Q And that the answers that you give me will</p> <p>14 be answers that we may use in court?</p> <p>15 A Yes.</p> <p>16 Q The rules take a -- regarding depositions</p> <p>17 are a little more lenient than the rules in actual</p> <p>18 court testimony, and, so, the basis is that you answer</p> <p>19 the questions I ask you unless your lawyer directs you</p> <p>20 not to answer it. At that time you follow the</p> <p>21 direction of your lawyer. If you need to take a break</p> <p>22 at any time, please say you need to take a break. I'm</p>	<p>1 will continue to answer the question unless your</p> <p>2 counsel directs you not to.</p> <p>3 The reason why you're here this morning is</p> <p>4 because you have prepared an expert report in support</p> <p>5 of the plaintiffs' case; do you understand that?</p> <p>6 A Yes.</p> <p>7 Q And the plaintiffs are several parents who</p> <p>8 have filed a lawsuit against the Dover School</p> <p>9 District; do you understand that?</p> <p>10 A Yes.</p> <p>11 Q And the Dover School District is considered</p> <p>12 the defendant in this case; do you understand that?</p> <p>13 A Yes.</p> <p>14 Q Have you talked to anyone in preparation for</p> <p>15 your deposition this morning?</p> <p>16 A No.</p> <p>17 MR. WILCOX: Excuse me. You talked</p> <p>18 with me.</p> <p>19 THE WITNESS: I thought you meant this</p> <p>20 morning did I talk --</p> <p>21 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>22 Q Well --</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

3 (Pages 9 to 12)

<p>9</p> <p>1 A -- did I talk to anyone --</p> <p>2 Q -- "this morning" --</p> <p>3 A -- this morning.</p> <p>4 Q In preparation for your deposition this</p> <p>5 morning --</p> <p>6 A Oh, okay.</p> <p>7 Q -- have you talked to anyone? It could have</p> <p>8 been yesterday or the day before.</p> <p>9 A Yes, I talked to Mr. Wilcox.</p> <p>10 MR. THOMPSON: I would like to have</p> <p>11 marked as Defendants Exhibit 1 a document entitled,</p> <p>12 John F. Haught Curriculum Vitae, and I've made copies</p> <p>13 for you and you.</p> <p>14 (Defendants Deposition Exhibit Number 1 was</p> <p>15 marked for identification and attached to the</p> <p>16 transcript.)</p> <p>17 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>18 Q I want to show you Defendants Exhibit 1 and</p> <p>19 ask if you could identify that?</p> <p>20 A Yes.</p> <p>21 Q And what is it?</p> <p>22 A It's my curriculum vitae.</p>	<p>11</p> <p>1 A They both went to private high schools,</p> <p>2 public grade schools.</p> <p>3 Q Okay. Private high schools, do you remember</p> <p>4 the name of the high schools?</p> <p>5 A The older son went to Gonzaga High School in</p> <p>6 Washington and the other son went to Bishop O'Connell</p> <p>7 in Arlington, Virginia.</p> <p>8 Q Are those both Roman Catholic?</p> <p>9 A Both of those are Roman Catholic schools.</p> <p>10 Q Have you ever been a party to a lawsuit</p> <p>11 before?</p> <p>12 A No.</p> <p>13 Q Okay. Have you testified -- have you ever</p> <p>14 testified in a trial --</p> <p>15 A No --</p> <p>16 Q -- before?</p> <p>17 A -- I haven't.</p> <p>18 MR. WILCOX: Just off the Record for a</p> <p>19 second.</p> <p>20 (Discussion off the Record.)</p> <p>21 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>22 Q What is your current occupation?</p>
<p>10</p> <p>1 Q And you prepared that?</p> <p>2 A I prepared this, yes.</p> <p>3 Q Okay. Would you please review it, and I'm</p> <p>4 going to ask you whether that is an accurate depiction</p> <p>5 of your history -- of your career and the books that</p> <p>6 you've written?</p> <p>7 A As far as I know, yes.</p> <p>8 Q Okay. You were born on November 12th, 1942?</p> <p>9 A Yes.</p> <p>10 Q Okay. And you're married?</p> <p>11 A I'm married.</p> <p>12 Q And what was the date of that marriage, if</p> <p>13 you recall?</p> <p>14 A September 4th, 1967.</p> <p>15 Q Okay. And you have two children?</p> <p>16 A Two children.</p> <p>17 Q And what are their ages?</p> <p>18 A Thirty -- one was born in 1970 and the other</p> <p>19 1973, so 34 and 32.</p> <p>20 Q Okay. Do you recall whether they went</p> <p>21 through a public high school or whether they went to a</p> <p>22 private school?</p>	<p>12</p> <p>1 A I am a writer and speaker -- lecturer. I</p> <p>2 have just retired from teaching at Georgetown.</p> <p>3 Q And what was the date of that retirement?</p> <p>4 A It will be -- well, the official date was</p> <p>5 May -- no, I'm sorry, August of 2000 and -- what's</p> <p>6 the -- 2004.</p> <p>7 Q 2004?</p> <p>8 A Uh-huh.</p> <p>9 Q Prior to your retirement from Georgetown,</p> <p>10 what was your position there?</p> <p>11 A I was the Healey Professor of Theology,</p> <p>12 Thomas Healey Professor of Theology.</p> <p>13 Q And how long had you held that position?</p> <p>14 A That particular chair only one year.</p> <p>15 Q And before then?</p> <p>16 A Before that I was the Landegger</p> <p>17 Distinguished Professor from 1996 to 2002.</p> <p>18 Q And that was also as a professor of</p> <p>19 theology?</p> <p>20 A Yes.</p> <p>21 Q Okay. When were you contacted by the</p> <p>22 plaintiffs to be an expert in this case?</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

4 (Pages 13 to 16)

<p>13</p> <p>1 A I believe it was in February of 2005.</p> <p>2 Q And who —</p> <p>3 A Possibly earlier. I don't remember.</p> <p>4 Q Who contacted you?</p> <p>5 A Steve Harvey.</p> <p>6 Q And do you know who he is?</p> <p>7 A He's a lawyer for Pepper Hamilton.</p> <p>8 Q Had you had any prior relationship with</p> <p>9 Mr. Harvey?</p> <p>10 A None whatsoever.</p> <p>11 Q Okay. What were you asked to do by</p> <p>12 Mr. Harvey?</p> <p>13 A To be a witness for this particular case.</p> <p>14 Q Did he ask you to be a witness in any</p> <p>15 particular area of the case or just be a witness in</p> <p>16 this case?</p> <p>17 A Well, to — to be a witness against — in</p> <p>18 the Civil Liberties or ACLU case against the Dover</p> <p>19 School Board.</p> <p>20 Q And did he tell you how you could help in</p> <p>21 that case?</p> <p>22 A I'm not sure that he ever said so</p>	<p>15</p> <p>1 for a number of years, particularly starting in 1995,</p> <p>2 but more recently in my books God After Darwin and</p> <p>3 Deeper Than Darwin as well as in many lectures and</p> <p>4 other articles and book chapters that I've</p> <p>5 contributed.</p> <p>6 Q Is it an accurate statement, then, that you</p> <p>7 became involved in a substantial degree with the issue</p> <p>8 of intelligent design theory in 1995?</p> <p>9 A I started probably before that, but</p> <p>10 especially since 1995, yes.</p> <p>11 Q How long before that had you become familiar</p> <p>12 or involved in studying the issue of intelligent</p> <p>13 design theory?</p> <p>14 A Well, since I've taught science and religion</p> <p>15 for 35 years, I have been implicitly and less</p> <p>16 intensely, but, nonetheless, substantively involved in</p> <p>17 discussions of intelligent design for many years.</p> <p>18 Q How many years?</p> <p>19 A I would say probably 20 — 15 to 20.</p> <p>20 Q At the earliest part of your interest in</p> <p>21 intelligent design theory 15 to 20 years ago, who were</p> <p>22 the proponents of intelligent design at that time?</p>
<p>14</p> <p>1 explicitly; I can't recall. But my assumption was he</p> <p>2 thought that I could be a — a witness in making a</p> <p>3 case against the Dover School Board's advice that</p> <p>4 students be exposed to intelligent design theory as an</p> <p>5 alternative to evolutionary biology as usually taught</p> <p>6 in the schools.</p> <p>7 Q Well, why did you agree to do that?</p> <p>8 A I did it out of principle that — a deep</p> <p>9 principle that I have that the school board was</p> <p>10 implicitly confusing issues in science and religion</p> <p>11 that should be carefully distinguished and that, in</p> <p>12 effect, the school board was proposing that science</p> <p>13 classrooms in Pennsylvania and presumably elsewhere</p> <p>14 should, in the interest of what they referred to as</p> <p>15 balanced treatment, give the students exposure to what</p> <p>16 they consider to be alternatives to evolutionary</p> <p>17 biology but which I consider to be not alternatives to</p> <p>18 biology but alternatives to a specific ideology.</p> <p>19 Q Did you come to that conclusion prior to</p> <p>20 agreeing to be an expert?</p> <p>21 A Yes, I had written about intelligent design</p> <p>22 and its relationship to the science and religion issue</p>	<p>16</p> <p>1 A Well, the term intelligent design theory was</p> <p>2 not in vogue at that time, but substantively there</p> <p>3 have always been what we would call proponents of</p> <p>4 natural theology going back a number of centuries, in</p> <p>5 fact, but I can't recall specifically what the names</p> <p>6 of the people were because it was just one general</p> <p>7 alternative in a wide spectrum of approaches in</p> <p>8 science and religion.</p> <p>9 Q When is the first article or book you</p> <p>10 published that touched upon intelligent design theory</p> <p>11 in any way?</p> <p>12 MR. WILCOX: Objection, vague. Could</p> <p>13 you use a more specific phrase than "touched upon"?</p> <p>14 Do you mean mentioned intelligent design?</p> <p>15 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you.</p> <p>16 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>17 Q Mentioning intelligent design.</p> <p>18 A I believe the first explicit mention of that</p> <p>19 formal term was in my book God After Darwin; although,</p> <p>20 it's possible — I don't recall that I mentioned it in</p> <p>21 an article published in a book by the Vatican Press or</p> <p>22 the — a book published jointly by the Center for</p>



DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

6 (Pages 21 to 24)

<p>21</p> <p>1 in 1995 --</p> <p>2 Q Okay.</p> <p>3 A -- God After Darwin in 1999 and Deeper Than</p> <p>4 Darwin in 2003.</p> <p>5 Q Are you --</p> <p>6 A And --</p> <p>7 Q Well, go ahead. I'm sorry.</p> <p>8 A And presently I'm working on a book which is</p> <p>9 going to be called Is Nature Enough, which is a</p> <p>10 critique of scientific naturalism.</p> <p>11 Q How far along are you in that book?</p> <p>12 A I'm pretty far along. I should be finished</p> <p>13 by the end of the summer.</p> <p>14 Q Does it deal with intelligent design?</p> <p>15 A Yes, it does in passing, but my book Deeper</p> <p>16 Than Darwin has a whole chapter on intelligent design,</p> <p>17 but this book deals with it in passing. I mention it</p> <p>18 quite often in the book as an inadequate response to</p> <p>19 the threat of secular -- of naturalism, rather, in</p> <p>20 intellectual life today.</p> <p>21 Q Does the book discuss Darwin's Theory of</p> <p>22 Evolution?</p>	<p>23</p> <p>1 A I would change some emphases; for example, I</p> <p>2 have a chapter on information in God After Darwin</p> <p>3 which has been somewhat coopted, I think erroneously,</p> <p>4 by Michael Behe and also more recently by William</p> <p>5 Dembski to be somehow supportive of their position. I</p> <p>6 would be more careful to phrase my position</p> <p>7 differently -- a little bit differently today than I</p> <p>8 did in that book because it -- the way I have it there</p> <p>9 it could possibly lead to misunderstandings of my</p> <p>10 basic position.</p> <p>11 Q Any other changes that you would make in any</p> <p>12 of the books that you have written, the three books</p> <p>13 that you've mentioned?</p> <p>14 A No substantive changes that I can think of</p> <p>15 at the moment.</p> <p>16 Q When did you first become interested in the</p> <p>17 theory of evolution?</p> <p>18 A Back when I was about 23 years old when I</p> <p>19 first read Teilhard de Chardin whose view was that</p> <p>20 nothing in biology can be understood apart from</p> <p>21 evolution, a view which had also been expressed by</p> <p>22 Theodosius Dobzhansky, a Russian Orthodox scientist.</p>
<p>22</p> <p>1 A Yes.</p> <p>2 MR. THOMPSON: I would like a copy of</p> <p>3 the manuscript under the same justification that the</p> <p>4 plaintiffs have asked for a copy of the manuscript of</p> <p>5 Bill Dembski's new book, Revising of Pandas and</p> <p>6 People.</p> <p>7 MR. WILCOX: Is there a reference in</p> <p>8 the report to it?</p> <p>9 MR. THOMPSON: No.</p> <p>10 MR. WILCOX: I don't think the analogy</p> <p>11 is quite apt, but I will take it under advisement and</p> <p>12 discuss it with the witness.</p> <p>13 THE WITNESS: It's still in the process</p> <p>14 of being written, so it's not my final thoughts on</p> <p>15 these issues.</p> <p>16 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>17 Q Have your thoughts been evolving -- I hate</p> <p>18 to use that word -- through time?</p> <p>19 A Of course. Of course.</p> <p>20 Q Looking back on the three books that you</p> <p>21 have published so far, would you change any of the</p> <p>22 conclusions that you've written?</p>	<p>24</p> <p>1 MR. THOMPSON: I would like to have</p> <p>2 this marked Defendants Exhibit 2.</p> <p>3 (Defendants Deposition Exhibit Number 2 was</p> <p>4 marked for identification and attached to the</p> <p>5 transcript.)</p> <p>6 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>7 Q Professor Haught, would you look at</p> <p>8 Defendants Exhibit 2 and see if you can identify that?</p> <p>9 A This is the report that I submitted in the</p> <p>10 proceedings in the United States District Court for</p> <p>11 the Middle District of Pennsylvania, Tammy Kitzmiller,</p> <p>12 et al. versus Dover Area School District and Dover</p> <p>13 Area School District Board of Directors.</p> <p>14 Q Is this what we would call your expert</p> <p>15 report?</p> <p>16 A It's an abstract of what would be much more</p> <p>17 detailed.</p> <p>18 Q And this was the report you prepared in</p> <p>19 response to the request of attorney Steve Harvey?</p> <p>20 A Yes.</p> <p>21 Q Okay. And you are aware that this report</p> <p>22 could be used by a judge to make a decision in this</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

7 (Pages 25 to 28)

<p>25</p> <p>1 case?</p> <p>2 MR. WILCOX: Objection.</p> <p>3 THE WITNESS: Yes, I am.</p> <p>4 MR. WILCOX: Objection.</p> <p>5 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>6 Q First a couple of general questions. Does</p> <p>7 this report contain a complete statement of all the</p> <p>8 expert opinions you intend to give in the court case?</p> <p>9 A Probably not. As I said, this is just a</p> <p>10 sketch of my -- of what would be a more substantive</p> <p>11 and more detailed testimony.</p> <p>12 Q So this is not a complete --</p> <p>13 A This is not -- not --</p> <p>14 Q -- opinion that you would --</p> <p>15 A Of course not.</p> <p>16 Q -- venture?</p> <p>17 A No.</p> <p>18 Q Have you written any supplemental reports?</p> <p>19 A In relation to this case?</p> <p>20 Q Yes.</p> <p>21 A No.</p> <p>22 Q Have you written any rebuttal reports to any</p>	<p>27</p> <p>1 A No, I did not read Shallit's.</p> <p>2 Q His is a rebuttal report.</p> <p>3 A I can't remember.</p> <p>4 Q Okay. At the time that you prepared this</p> <p>5 report, were you aware of the other expert reports,</p> <p>6 both plaintiffs' and defendants'?</p> <p>7 A No, I knew vaguely that some people had been</p> <p>8 solicited to write other expert reports, but I did not</p> <p>9 know who they were or what they were going to say.</p> <p>10 Q Did you contact any of the other experts</p> <p>11 prior to writing this report?</p> <p>12 A I did not.</p> <p>13 Q Okay. So you cannot say today or you said</p> <p>14 to the contrary that this report does not contain all</p> <p>15 of your opinions that you would venture in this case?</p> <p>16 A No, I've written a number of pieces; more</p> <p>17 recently a book called Debating Design. I have a more</p> <p>18 thorough discussion of intelligent design there than I</p> <p>19 do here. In my book Deeper Than Darwin I discuss</p> <p>20 intelligent design in much more depth than I do here.</p> <p>21 This is only a kind of, as I said, very sketchy</p> <p>22 representation of what I would say if I had time to</p>
<p>26</p> <p>1 of the experts that the defendants have provided?</p> <p>2 A I have not written any, no.</p> <p>3 Q Okay. Have you seen any of the reports that</p> <p>4 the expert -- experts for the defendants have written?</p> <p>5 A Yes, and I read through most of them; some</p> <p>6 of them more hurriedly than others.</p> <p>7 Q When did you do that?</p> <p>8 A I started doing that about two weeks ago.</p> <p>9 Q Okay. So your expert report, Exhibit 2, was</p> <p>10 written prior to the time you saw any of the other</p> <p>11 expert reports?</p> <p>12 A Yes, I had seen no others at the time.</p> <p>13 Q Okay. What about the experts on your side,</p> <p>14 the expert opinions that the plaintiffs had; have you</p> <p>15 seen any of their reports?</p> <p>16 A I've read hurriedly Pennock's. I'm already</p> <p>17 familiar with Kenneth Miller's approach. For many</p> <p>18 years I've studied his work. Who else is there?</p> <p>19 Q Barbara Forrest?</p> <p>20 A I read through hers, also, yes.</p> <p>21 Q Okay. Any others? Shallit, Professor</p> <p>22 Shallit?</p>	<p>28</p> <p>1 develop this in book-length form.</p> <p>2 Q Okay. Whether in book-length form or not,</p> <p>3 I'm interested in what you would be testifying as an</p> <p>4 expert in court regarding this issue. You're saying</p> <p>5 that your opinions would be much broader than the</p> <p>6 opinions that you give in this report?</p> <p>7 MR. WILCOX: Objection. What he will</p> <p>8 testify to will be in response to those questions that</p> <p>9 are put to him, naturally, and those questions will be</p> <p>10 posed by counsel. To the extent that defense counsel</p> <p>11 wishes to bring out even further material by</p> <p>12 cross-examining, defense counsel can do that. But for</p> <p>13 the witness to sit here today and predict what he will</p> <p>14 be asked and what he might be asked on</p> <p>15 cross-examination, I think, is asking too much of the</p> <p>16 witness.</p> <p>17 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>18 Q Well, you've indicated your opinion would be</p> <p>19 much broader than what you've prepared in your report;</p> <p>20 is that correct?</p> <p>21 A The opinions that I have about intelligent</p> <p>22 design have been developed -- developing for a number</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

8 (Pages 29 to 32)

<p>29</p> <p>1 of years.</p> <p>2 Q I'm talking about your expert report.</p> <p>3 A My expert report I would say is accurate but</p> <p>4 not adequate as far as my own understanding of and</p> <p>5 criticism of intelligent design is concerned.</p> <p>6 Q What about as it relates to the particular</p> <p>7 case that we're involved with?</p> <p>8 MR. WILCOX: Objection, vague.</p> <p>9 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>10 Q Do you think it's -- do you think this -- do</p> <p>11 you think your report is adequate for the particular</p> <p>12 case that we are involved with today?</p> <p>13 MR. WILCOX: Objection. That calls for</p> <p>14 a legal conclusion as to what's required under Rule</p> <p>15 26. This expert is not here as a legal expert.</p> <p>16 MR. THOMPSON: I didn't ask a legal</p> <p>17 conclusion.</p> <p>18 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>19 Q I asked your own opinion as an expert in</p> <p>20 this area.</p> <p>21 A Is it adequate?</p> <p>22 Q Yes.</p>	<p>31</p> <p>1 A About a week. I was not working at it</p> <p>2 steadily, but I had it pretty well worked out within a</p> <p>3 week.</p> <p>4 Q Did you refer to any other documents as you</p> <p>5 prepared this report?</p> <p>6 A Did I consult any --</p> <p>7 Q Yes, or consult or refer.</p> <p>8 A -- consult any other documents?</p> <p>9 Well, I had -- I consulted some sections Of</p> <p>10 Pandas and People that had been brought to my</p> <p>11 attention.</p> <p>12 Q By whom?</p> <p>13 A By Steve Harvey whose --</p> <p>14 Q Did you read the entire book?</p> <p>15 A I did not read the entire book. I can tell</p> <p>16 you that I have the book, but I started to read it and</p> <p>17 immediately considered it to be a waste of my time.</p> <p>18 Q Why is that?</p> <p>19 A Because there are much more sophisticated</p> <p>20 presentations of the intelligent design position that</p> <p>21 I was already familiar with.</p> <p>22 Q In preparing for the report did you look at</p>
<p>30</p> <p>1 MR. WILCOX: Objection.</p> <p>2 THE WITNESS: As I've been saying --</p> <p>3 well...</p> <p>4 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>5 Q Go ahead and answer it unless your --</p> <p>6 A As I've been saying, it's an accurate but</p> <p>7 not an adequate representation of the full view of the</p> <p>8 opinions that I have about the topic.</p> <p>9 Q Okay. What about the bases; have you</p> <p>10 provided all the bases that you have for your opinion</p> <p>11 that you've written in this expert report?</p> <p>12 A No, because I did it in such a way as to</p> <p>13 make it readable and presentable to people who are not</p> <p>14 experts in theology, so I've left out a considerable</p> <p>15 amount of theological background out of which I am</p> <p>16 issuing this report.</p> <p>17 Q And you say you left out a considerable</p> <p>18 amount?</p> <p>19 A I left out most of my theology of evolution</p> <p>20 in this report.</p> <p>21 Q How long did it take for you to write this</p> <p>22 report?</p>	<p>32</p> <p>1 any other documents that were provided for you by</p> <p>2 Mr. Harvey or the law firm representing --</p> <p>3 A Not that I recall --</p> <p>4 Q -- the plaintiffs?</p> <p>5 A Not that I recall at the moment.</p> <p>6 Q Okay. Did you look at the complaint that</p> <p>7 was filed in the lawsuit?</p> <p>8 A I did read the complaint.</p> <p>9 Q Okay. Did you look at the answer?</p> <p>10 A And the answer as well.</p> <p>11 Q Did you look at the policy itself?</p> <p>12 A Was that -- if that was included in the...</p> <p>13 document that I was given, I -- I'm assuming that I</p> <p>14 did. I read the whole document that -- that was -- I</p> <p>15 don't know whether the policy -- whether --</p> <p>16 Q Did you look at a particular document that</p> <p>17 was -- that was a two-paged document that was</p> <p>18 entitled -- in fact, let's just mark it.</p> <p>19 MR. THOMPSON: Would you mark this?</p> <p>20 (Defendants Deposition Exhibit Number 3 was</p> <p>21 marked for identification and attached to the</p> <p>22 transcript.)</p>



DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

9 (Pages 33 to 36)

<p>33</p> <p>1 THE WITNESS: I read everything that</p> <p>2 Steve gave me.</p> <p>3 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>4 Q Okay. I want you to look at that. It's</p> <p>5 Defendants Exhibit 3. It's entitled Board Press</p> <p>6 Release for Biology Curriculum, 11-19-04, Re-posted</p> <p>7 12-14-04.</p> <p>8 A (Witness reviews document.) I can't recall</p> <p>9 right now whether I actually read this or not.</p> <p>10 Q Okay.</p> <p>11 A But if it was included in the packet of</p> <p>12 material that Steve Harvey made available to me, then</p> <p>13 I did read it because I read everything in that</p> <p>14 packet.</p> <p>15 Q When were you given that packet?</p> <p>16 A I think it was in February, some time in</p> <p>17 February or -- yes, February or March. I can't</p> <p>18 remember exactly.</p> <p>19 Q Can you describe the packet in any greater</p> <p>20 detail?</p> <p>21 A I just read the -- what I recall in the</p> <p>22 packet was the complaint and the -- the answer.</p>	<p>35</p> <p>1 Q In preparation for your report, did you</p> <p>2 speak to any school board members of the Dover Area</p> <p>3 School District?</p> <p>4 A I did not.</p> <p>5 Q Did you speak to any of the parents --</p> <p>6 A I did not.</p> <p>7 Q -- who are the plaintiffs in the case?</p> <p>8 A I did not.</p> <p>9 Q Did you speak to any of the teachers?</p> <p>10 A I did not.</p> <p>11 Q Did you talk to any of the students?</p> <p>12 A I did not.</p> <p>13 Q Did you read the biology textbook that was</p> <p>14 being used by the ninth grade biology course?</p> <p>15 A I did not.</p> <p>16 Q Did you read any court opinions dealing with</p> <p>17 the teaching of evolution or intelligent design?</p> <p>18 A I did not read them in preparation for this</p> <p>19 particular statement, but I had read over court</p> <p>20 statements that had been made in the past, in the</p> <p>21 Arkansas creation trial, for example, and I'm familiar</p> <p>22 with the ideas of Michael Ruse and Langdon Gilkey, a</p>
<p>34</p> <p>1 Q Okay. You don't recall this Defendants</p> <p>2 Exhibit Number 3?</p> <p>3 A No.</p> <p>4 Q Okay. You indicated it took you about a</p> <p>5 week to write the report but not every hour of the</p> <p>6 week. How many hours would you say you spent on it?</p> <p>7 A Maybe 15.</p> <p>8 Q Okay. Did you receive any compensation for</p> <p>9 your expert opinion?</p> <p>10 A No compensation.</p> <p>11 Q Did you ask for any?</p> <p>12 A I did not ask for any.</p> <p>13 Q Why not?</p> <p>14 A I didn't ask for it because I felt that it</p> <p>15 was my duty as someone who is a -- considered to be an</p> <p>16 expert in this area to educate the parties involved as</p> <p>17 well as -- as well as the public who will read about</p> <p>18 this case in what I consider to be important</p> <p>19 distinctions in the field of science and religion,</p> <p>20 evolution and theology, that are being left out, that</p> <p>21 are not being made by various parties involved in the</p> <p>22 case.</p>	<p>36</p> <p>1 theologian who was involved in the case, in the</p> <p>2 Arkansas case, and who was at that time a professor of</p> <p>3 theology at the University of Chicago but who later</p> <p>4 came to Georgetown University at my invitation when I</p> <p>5 was chair of the department.</p> <p>6 Q Did you read the case of Aguillard versus --</p> <p>7 MR. WILCOX: Edwards v. Aguillard.</p> <p>8 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>9 Q -- Edwards versus Aguillard?</p> <p>10 A I did not read -- I don't recall whether I</p> <p>11 read it or not.</p> <p>12 Q That's a United States Supreme Court case</p> <p>13 that was decided in 1987; do you remember reading that</p> <p>14 at all?</p> <p>15 A Not with reference to this case. I probably</p> <p>16 read it in the past because I've been interested in</p> <p>17 the issue.</p> <p>18 Q Okay. But you would not consider yourself a</p> <p>19 constitutional law expert, would you?</p> <p>20 A No.</p> <p>21 Q Did anyone assist you in writing this expert</p> <p>22 report?</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

10 (Pages 37 to 40)

<p>37</p> <p>1 A No one -- no, no one.</p> <p>2 Q Okay. In preparation for your expert</p> <p>3 opinion did you read any of the Pennsylvania Academic</p> <p>4 Science Standards?</p> <p>5 A No.</p> <p>6 Q Since this report has been written you</p> <p>7 indicated you read some of the other expert opinion</p> <p>8 reports from your side.</p> <p>9 A Yes, I read them very quickly.</p> <p>10 Q Okay. Do you recall if you disagreed with</p> <p>11 any of the conclusions?</p> <p>12 A I did not disagree substantively with any of</p> <p>13 them. I do have some differences in terms of</p> <p>14 vocabulary, for example. I do not refer to</p> <p>15 intelligent design as creationism whereas others do,</p> <p>16 and I would have emphasized perhaps more clearly than</p> <p>17 Pennock and Forrest the distinctions between</p> <p>18 intelligent design and creationism.</p> <p>19 Q Were there any other disagreements that you</p> <p>20 could remember?</p> <p>21 A No.</p> <p>22 Q Now, do you know any of these people</p>	<p>39</p> <p>1 resume.</p> <p>2 Q Okay.</p> <p>3 A But my main focus throughout my career at</p> <p>4 Georgetown, and increasingly so as my career went</p> <p>5 along, was to deal with issues in science and</p> <p>6 religion.</p> <p>7 Q Well, do you consider yourself an expert in</p> <p>8 the field of biology?</p> <p>9 A No, I'm not an expert in any particular</p> <p>10 science. I'm not a scientist. I'm a theologian.</p> <p>11 Q Okay. So I want to go down a list so I make</p> <p>12 sure. You don't consider yourself an expert in</p> <p>13 microbiology?</p> <p>14 A No.</p> <p>15 Q Chemistry?</p> <p>16 A No, not -- by "expert" could you clarify</p> <p>17 what you mean?</p> <p>18 Q An expert that can -- that either deals with</p> <p>19 it as a subject matter they teach; that is someone</p> <p>20 that is involved in the actual field, such as</p> <p>21 chemistry labs; a man like Behe being involved with</p> <p>22 studying under a microscope.</p>
<p>38</p> <p>1 personally, Pennock or Forrest?</p> <p>2 A I've never met Pennock. I did meet Barbara</p> <p>3 Forrest when I made a speaking trip to Louisiana just</p> <p>4 this past month of April after both of us had</p> <p>5 submitted our reports.</p> <p>6 Q Where was that? Where did you have that</p> <p>7 speech?</p> <p>8 A I gave a talk at Southeastern Louisiana</p> <p>9 University where she's a professor.</p> <p>10 Q And what was the title of your speech?</p> <p>11 A God After Darwin.</p> <p>12 Q Okay. Now, in your classes at Georgetown,</p> <p>13 what year students did you have?</p> <p>14 A All four years.</p> <p>15 Q Okay. And did you teach more than one</p> <p>16 class -- one subject matter in those courses? I'm not</p> <p>17 sure I'm asking that question correctly. Was there</p> <p>18 more than one course you taught?</p> <p>19 A Each semester during most of my career at</p> <p>20 Georgetown we were required to teach three courses, so</p> <p>21 I taught a course called 'The Problem of God. I taught</p> <p>22 a number of other courses which are listed in my</p>	<p>40</p> <p>1 A I have no formal postgraduate training in</p> <p>2 any of the natural sciences. My knowledge of these</p> <p>3 comes from my own reading of presentations by</p> <p>4 scientists of their field.</p> <p>5 Q Okay. Would you consider yourself an expert</p> <p>6 in mathematics?</p> <p>7 A No.</p> <p>8 Q Probabilities?</p> <p>9 A No.</p> <p>10 Q Would you consider yourself an expert in the</p> <p>11 philosophy of science?</p> <p>12 A I'm more familiar with that and more expert</p> <p>13 in that than I am with science.</p> <p>14 Q Are you a member of any organizations of</p> <p>15 scholars who are philosophers of science?</p> <p>16 A I'm a member of the International Society</p> <p>17 for Science and Religion, which includes some of our</p> <p>18 best philosophers of science.</p> <p>19 Q But that's not necessarily --</p> <p>20 A I'm a member --</p> <p>21 Q Okay. Excuse me.</p> <p>22 A -- the American Academy of Religion, of the</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

11 (Pages 41 to 44)

<p style="text-align: right;">41</p> <p>1 Catholic Theological Society of America. I'm a member          2 of The Center for Process Studies, which includes a          3 lot of philosophies of science.          4 Q Those are organizations that philosophers of          5 science may belong to but those are not organizations          6 primarily for philosophers of science; is that          7 correct?          8 MR. WILCOX: Objection.          9 THE WITNESS: That's correct.          10 BY MR. THOMPSON:          11 Q Okay. What about philosophy of education;          12 do you consider yourself an expert in the philosophy          13 of education?          14 A I'm not an expert, but because of my reading          15 of Alfred North Whitehead, I have definite opinions on          16 what would constitute good education.          17 Q And those opinions are primarily based on          18 your reading of that one book?          19 A The one book of Whitehead's? No, I've read          20 many books of Whitehead.          21 Q Okay. But those -- the books of          22 Whitehead --</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">43</p> <p>1 with Bill Dembski.          2 Q You've been jointly interviewed, as I          3 recall?          4 A Yes. We were together at Oxford University          5 several summers ago, and we had a joint presentation          6 in which we presented our own positions and then          7 afterwards we conducted an interview for theology and          8 science.          9 Q Based upon your contacts with Mr. Dembski,          10 do you consider him a credible mathematician?          11 A Yes.          12 Q Based on your contacts with Michael Behe, do          13 you consider him a credible biologist?          14 A When he's doing his biology, I consider him          15 credible. When he's doing philosophy of science, I do          16 not.          17 Q Okay. He has written a book review on one          18 of your books. I'm not sure which one it was now.          19 A It was God After Darwin.          20 Q God After Darwin. And as I recall, he          21 basically -- one of the conclusions he had was that          22 you're a -- you're an intelligent design theorist.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">42</p> <p>1 A Yes.          2 Q -- are the basis for your expertise in          3 education?          4 A I didn't use the term expertise. I said my          5 knowledge, my understanding of what would constitute          6 good education.          7 Q Okay. Do you consider yourself an expert on          8 genetics?          9 A No.          10 Q Okay. Would you consider Michael Behe a          11 scientist?          12 A Yes, I do.          13 Q Would you consider Bill Dembski a scientist?          14 A I think he would be a mathematician more          15 than a scientist.          16 Q What is your definition of a scientist, I          17 guess I should ask?          18 A A scientist is someone who is trained in          19 scientific method and who applies it in teaching,          20 writing and experimentation.          21 Q Do you know Bill Dembski?          22 A I have met him and had amiable conversations</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">44</p> <p>1 A Well, as I said earlier, he focused in on          2 that chapter which I would -- if I had a chance to do          3 it over, I would probably change some of the wording          4 so that he would not see myself as an advocate of          5 intelligent design.          6 Q What was the basis for his opinion?          7 A The basis for his opinion was that I had          8 presented the informational aspect of nature as          9 distinct from the material and energetic components of          10 nature, and since "information" is a term that can          11 easily be conflated, I think quite wrongly, with what          12 intelligent design means by design, he considered my          13 approach to be not far from his camp. And I did          14 respond to that article, that review that he wrote,          15 and in my response I referred to my Whiteheadian          16 approach as one that would introduce the notion of          17 novelty along with the notion of order as          18 indispensable to understanding the natural world.          19 Q That was back in 1999 as I recall; is that          20 correct?          21 A 1999 or 2000. I can't remember exactly the          22 date.</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

12 (Pages 45 to 48)

<p>45</p> <p>1 Q In fact, that exchange between you and Behe</p> <p>2 was quite civil as I recall reading?</p> <p>3 A I try to be civil in all my exchanges.</p> <p>4 (Recess -- 9:54 a.m.)</p> <p>5 (After recess -- 9:58 a.m.)</p> <p>6 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>7 Q Are you familiar with the book written by</p> <p>8 Michael Behe entitled Darwin's Black Box?</p> <p>9 A Yes, I've read that book.</p> <p>10 Q And, in fact, isn't that a book that you</p> <p>11 recommend to your students?</p> <p>12 A I don't have them read the book, but I have</p> <p>13 them read essays that reflect the content of that</p> <p>14 book.</p> <p>15 Q Okay. Could you describe what the book</p> <p>16 really is about?</p> <p>17 A Very briefly it's an attempt to show the</p> <p>18 Darwinian theory is incapable of adequately explaining</p> <p>19 certain biochemical phenomena, subcellular phenomena</p> <p>20 that possess what Behe refers to as Irreducible</p> <p>21 complexity.</p> <p>22 Q And you are familiar with that phrase</p>	<p>47</p> <p>1 Q And he talks about the bacterial flagellum</p> <p>2 as a biologist; is that correct?</p> <p>3 A As a biochemist.</p> <p>4 Q Biochemist, right. And do you recall what</p> <p>5 he says about that?</p> <p>6 A Well, he sees it as analogous to an outboard</p> <p>7 motor; that the parts are coordinated in such a way</p> <p>8 that the only conclusion he can draw as far as</p> <p>9 explaining it is that some form of what he calls</p> <p>10 intelligent design was operative in its manufacture.</p> <p>11 Q And he also discusses other biological --</p> <p>12 A Phenomena.</p> <p>13 Q -- phenomena; is that correct?</p> <p>14 A Yes.</p> <p>15 Q In this book, in this book.</p> <p>16 A Yes.</p> <p>17 Q Do you remember the others?</p> <p>18 A The eye blood-clotting mechanism in</p> <p>19 particular.</p> <p>20 Q And he discusses those in scientific terms;</p> <p>21 is that correct?</p> <p>22 A He does discuss them in scientific terms up</p>
<p>46</p> <p>1 irreducible complexity?</p> <p>2 A Yes.</p> <p>3 Q And what does it mean to you?</p> <p>4 A Irreducible complexity is the characteristic</p> <p>5 of any system made up of multiple components in which</p> <p>6 if any particular component were absent the particular</p> <p>7 system could not function in such a way as to be able</p> <p>8 to be selected by natural selection. The idea of the</p> <p>9 book -- the argument of the book is one that appeals</p> <p>10 to a statement by Charles Darwin himself; that if it</p> <p>11 could be shown that evolution occurs in any other way</p> <p>12 than by minute, incremental, gradual steps, that his</p> <p>13 theory would fall apart. And Behe's point is that</p> <p>14 subcellular mechanisms which exhibit irreducible</p> <p>15 complexity could not possibly have been put together</p> <p>16 by small, gradual, incremental, minute stages of</p> <p>17 development, and, therefore, some other explanation</p> <p>18 than Darwinian explanation is needed to explain the</p> <p>19 irreducible complexity.</p> <p>20 Q One of the biological matters that he talks</p> <p>21 about is the bacterial flagellum; is that correct?</p> <p>22 A Yes.</p>	<p>48</p> <p>1 to a point, but he explains them in nonscientific</p> <p>2 terms ultimately.</p> <p>3 Q And the explanation in nonscientific terms</p> <p>4 is what?</p> <p>5 A Is the use of the word intelligence in</p> <p>6 intelligent design, which is not considered to be by</p> <p>7 conventional science an explanatory category at least</p> <p>8 as far as the self-limiting discipline of natural</p> <p>9 science is concerned.</p> <p>10 Q Now, as I recall, in response to his review</p> <p>11 of your book, God After Darwin, you responded back and</p> <p>12 indicated that you enjoyed reading Darwin's Black Box;</p> <p>13 is that accurate?</p> <p>14 A Yes, I enjoy reading Friedrich Nietzsche and</p> <p>15 atheistic tracts, as well.</p> <p>16 Q However, you also said, and I quote, I make</p> <p>17 sure that my students become familiar with its</p> <p>18 argument and I suspect that discussion of it has</p> <p>19 enriched many science and religion courses in the last</p> <p>20 few years --</p> <p>21 A Yes.</p> <p>22 Q -- end of quote?</p>



DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

13 (Pages 49 to 52)

<p style="text-align: right;">49</p> <p>1 A Yes.</p> <p>2 Q Is that a statement that you made?</p> <p>3 A Yes. Can I explain that statement?</p> <p>4 Q Yes, please do.</p> <p>5 A In the same sense -- enriched in the same</p> <p>6 sense as my students in The Problem of God course are</p> <p>7 enriched by reading the writings of atheists like</p> <p>8 Sigmund Freud, Albert Camus and Jean-Paul Sartre,</p> <p>9 because it invokes a critical sense in the students</p> <p>10 that enriches their lives. So the enrichment refers</p> <p>11 not to the possibility that they're enriched by the</p> <p>12 specific content, that they appropriate that content</p> <p>13 as their own thinking, but that it places them in</p> <p>14 conversation with other positions that allows them to</p> <p>15 develop a critical sense and develop their own</p> <p>16 positions.</p> <p>17 Q That's the purpose of education, is it not?</p> <p>18 A That's one of the purposes of education.</p> <p>19 Q Yes. It encourages critical thinking?</p> <p>20 A Yeah. You have to remember I'm doing this</p> <p>21 in a theology class and not a science class. In</p> <p>22 science classes I would not consider it appropriate to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">51</p> <p>1 intelligent design with his own theory of evolution,</p> <p>2 was he not?</p> <p>3 A He considered the biological record to be</p> <p>4 one that placed in question a certain type of natural</p> <p>5 theology represented by William Paley and earlier by</p> <p>6 other philosophers and theologians. He did not deny</p> <p>7 the existence of design; adaptive design was something</p> <p>8 that he was able to detect as a science -- scientist.</p> <p>9 But in explaining adaptive design, he no longer</p> <p>10 considered it essential to refer to directly</p> <p>11 theological divine intervention as its immediate</p> <p>12 explanation.</p> <p>13 Q Well, Paley talked about the blind -- talked</p> <p>14 about the watchmaker; is that correct?</p> <p>15 A Yes.</p> <p>16 Q Okay. And on the basis of the watchmaker</p> <p>17 analogy, he came to the conclusion there was a design.</p> <p>18 On the other hand, Darwin looked at that and said, it</p> <p>19 is not design; it's natural selection; correct?</p> <p>20 A What Darwin was able to discover was that</p> <p>21 the immediate proximate explanations of the adaptive</p> <p>22 design included many, many years, first of all, deep</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">50</p> <p>1 bring in intelligent design as an alternative -- as a</p> <p>2 scientific alternative or allegedly scientific</p> <p>3 alternative to evolutionary biology.</p> <p>4 Q Wouldn't it provide the same kind of</p> <p>5 critical thinking mechanism?</p> <p>6 A It would if it were done in a course on</p> <p>7 critical thinking, but it could be very confusing to</p> <p>8 students if it were presented as an alternative to</p> <p>9 scientific ideas.</p> <p>10 Q Well, is critical thinking only a matter of</p> <p>11 concern for educators in courses on critical thinking?</p> <p>12 A No, but there are different kinds of</p> <p>13 critical thinking following different methods. One</p> <p>14 example of critical thinking is learning to</p> <p>15 distinguish between scientific method and</p> <p>16 philosophical and ideological and theological</p> <p>17 assumptions of beliefs.</p> <p>18 Q Well, we'll get to that in a moment, but</p> <p>19 didn't Darwin himself in The Origin of Species discuss</p> <p>20 intelligent design?</p> <p>21 A Implicitly, yes.</p> <p>22 Q And he was comparing and contrasting</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">52</p> <p>1 time -- lots of time had to be involved. There had to</p> <p>2 be persistent law, which he referred to as natural</p> <p>3 selection, and there had to be variations which</p> <p>4 provided the raw material for natural selection, and</p> <p>5 these variations as far as he could tell are random in</p> <p>6 the sense that they are not directed by any</p> <p>7 intelligent design.</p> <p>8 Q And, again, going back to the question that</p> <p>9 started all of this, is Darwin actually in his book to</p> <p>10 prove natural selection many times made reference to</p> <p>11 design?</p> <p>12 A Uh-huh. Yes.</p> <p>13 Q Okay. And you see something wrong with that</p> <p>14 in classes today --</p> <p>15 MR. WILCOX: Objection.</p> <p>16 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>17 Q -- this analytical thinking that would go</p> <p>18 on?</p> <p>19 MR. WILCOX: Objection. You should</p> <p>20 answer.</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: Okay. The Origin of</p> <p>22 Species, like many discursive scientific texts, often</p>



DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

14 (Pages 53 to 56)

<p>53</p> <p>1 includes philosophical asides which are not strictly  2 part of scientific experimentation but which are  3 interpretations, and I have no doubt that what —  4 Darwin himself, because he was — his — he cut his  5 theological teeth on William Paley and natural  6 theology, was mixing in philosophical and sometimes  7 theological statements with the empirical information  8 that had led him to his evolutionary theory. And at  9 times he is stepping out of his shoes as a strict  10 scientist and he is presenting his ideas in the  11 context — in a larger intellectual context, that of  12 the discussion that was going on at the time between  13 advocates of William Paley on the one hand and  14 advocates of a more — more or less agnostic or  15 naturalistic understanding of evolution on the other.  16 BY MR. THOMPSON:  17 Q Assuming that that's what he was doing, did  18 that in any way affect the validity of his theory?  19 A You can distinguish — if you can read the  20 book carefully, you can distinguish the scientific  21 aspects from the philosophical interpretations that  22 sometimes he gets in — philosophical discussions that</p>	<p>55</p> <p>1 of science is. What is it?  2 A Science is a self-limiting method which  3 seeks to understand natural phenomena at a certain  4 level of observation and understanding, and it's a  5 method which self-consciously leaves out any — any  6 invoking of notions of value, meaning, purpose, God or  7 intelligence and attempts to understand events in  8 terms of their efficient and material causes resorting  9 to hypotheses and theories to make sense of the data  10 that is experienced in any particular field,  11 subjecting these hypotheses and theories to ongoing  12 inquiry and criticism as new data come in from those  13 who are working in the field.  14 Q That has not always been the definition of  15 science, has it?  16 A People are free to define terms the way they  17 want to. There are people who talk about, for  18 example, a sacred science. Theology was sometimes  19 referred to as a science from the Latin word scientia,  20 which means knowledge, but increasingly in modern  21 times, since the 17th century, what we refer to as  22 natural science, I think, is pretty close to the</p>
<p>54</p> <p>1 he sometimes becomes involved in.  2 Q He, in fact, mentioned the creator, did he  3 not, in his last paragraph of the book?  4 A Yes, he did, and that's a good example of  5 what I mean of his stepping out of the shoes of a  6 strict scientist in making such a statement. That is  7 not a scientific statement. That's a reflection by a  8 deep and sensitive man on the implications, the wider  9 implications of what he had discovered.  10 Q Well, because he makes that one statement at  11 the end of the book, would you then indicate that that  12 book does not belong in a science class?  13 A Darwin himself regretted making that  14 statement later on.  15 Q Okay. But I am asking you the question.  16 A Yes. I do not think that a science class or  17 scientific method should ever bring in the notion of  18 God. That's not to say that a wider education  19 shouldn't bring it in, but science and science classes  20 themselves should not bring in theological ideas  21 including intelligent design.  22 Q Well, that gets me to what your definition</p>	<p>56</p> <p>1 definition that I just gave.  2 Q Some philosophers of science say that those  3 kinds of definitions are arbitrary demarcations. Do  4 you know of any of those philosophers of science?  5 A There are some philosophers of science who  6 are experts in what they call the field of sociology  7 of knowledge which emphasize the historical and  8 cultural and specifically conditioned — culturally  9 conditioned, historically conditioned character of all  10 human knowledge. What these philosophers are saying  11 applies not to science but to any kind of knowledge;  12 that we want to understand the knowing process today,  13 we have to take into account the historical, social,  14 cultural context of knowledge, and that includes the  15 natural sciences.  16 Q So the way you would distinguish science  17 from not science is the methodological activities?  18 A We —  19 MR. WILCOX: May I have it understood  20 that when you are now using the word science you're  21 referring to natural science; you're not referring to  22 social science, economic science?</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

15 (Pages 57 to 60)

<p>57</p> <p>1 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>2 Q I'm not sure. I guess that's a part of the</p> <p>3 point of what is science.</p> <p>4 A I'm referring to the natural sciences</p> <p>5 because that's the issue involved in this particular</p> <p>6 case. I'm not talking about social sciences.</p> <p>7 Q Well, let's go -- let's talk about natural</p> <p>8 science. What about Larry Laudan; are you familiar</p> <p>9 with him?</p> <p>10 A No.</p> <p>11 Q Okay. Science is a search for truth; is</p> <p>12 that too general?</p> <p>13 A That's entirely too general. So is theology</p> <p>14 a search for truth, so is philosophy a search for</p> <p>15 truth, so is poetry.</p> <p>16 Q Do you agree or disagree with the statement</p> <p>17 that science is argumentation?</p> <p>18 A All of our disciplines flow from what I</p> <p>19 would call the desire to know, but after we have said</p> <p>20 that, we have to recognize that the desire to know</p> <p>21 reality flows down different channels, and one method</p> <p>22 will leave out things that others bring in.</p>	<p>59</p> <p>1 divine wisdom in making the universe the kind of</p> <p>2 universe that it is, but it is definitely not the</p> <p>3 business of science itself -- natural science itself</p> <p>4 to enter into that discussion.</p> <p>5 Q But there's some people, let's say, as Bill</p> <p>6 Dembski and Michael Behe who disagree with that</p> <p>7 definition of science; is that true?</p> <p>8 A Yes, that's because they are seeking to</p> <p>9 redefine science in what I consider to be a</p> <p>10 prescientific way. They're conflating science with</p> <p>11 simple search for truth, and while science is one way</p> <p>12 of searching for truth, it's not the only way. They</p> <p>13 are ending up conflating -- by that by which I mean</p> <p>14 confusing -- a broader quest for truth, which is</p> <p>15 legitimate, which is something I myself am involved</p> <p>16 in, with the kind of self-limiting search for truth</p> <p>17 that's characteristic of scientific method.</p> <p>18 Q Can you use a scientific method to prove a</p> <p>19 scientific method?</p> <p>20 A Certainly not. Scientism, which is the</p> <p>21 belief that science is the only road to truth, is an</p> <p>22 ideology. It's a belief. It's a belief, moreover,</p>
<p>58</p> <p>1 One of the characteristics of natural</p> <p>2 scientific method is that it self-consciously leaves</p> <p>3 out certain kinds of questions that people ask, such</p> <p>4 as what is the meaning of my life; why is there</p> <p>5 anything at all rather than nothing; is there purpose</p> <p>6 in the universe?</p> <p>7 Science -- natural science -- and by</p> <p>8 "science," I mean natural science -- science</p> <p>9 deliberately and self-consciously, since the 17th</p> <p>10 century in the case of a vast majority of people who</p> <p>11 call themselves scientists, has deliberately and</p> <p>12 self-consciously and methodologically left out certain</p> <p>13 types of questions which would confuse and interfere</p> <p>14 with what is specifically scientific method. And one</p> <p>15 of the things that they leave out is the notion of</p> <p>16 intelligence as an explanatory category.</p> <p>17 This is not to deny that intelligence at</p> <p>18 some level could be brought in in a different kind of</p> <p>19 search for understanding; for example, I, myself,</p> <p>20 believe that at a certain level of understanding and</p> <p>21 inquiry we can and I believe we should appeal to some</p> <p>22 notion of divine intelligence -- I would prefer to say</p>	<p>60</p> <p>1 which often leads to materialism, which is also a</p> <p>2 belief, a belief that matter is all there is. Those</p> <p>3 are ideologies which are not part of science which</p> <p>4 should not be part of a scientific classroom either.</p> <p>5 Q Would it be a fair statement to say, then,</p> <p>6 the scientific method that you have proposed is also a</p> <p>7 hypothesis?</p> <p>8 MR. WILCOX: Objection. That's so</p> <p>9 vague. When you say the scientific method that he has</p> <p>10 proposed, I have no idea what you're --</p> <p>11 THE WITNESS: Scientific -- yeah,</p> <p>12 that's a confusing way to put it.</p> <p>13 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>14 Q Well, you defined science in a couple of</p> <p>15 long paragraphs.</p> <p>16 A Science is a method which resorts to</p> <p>17 hypotheses, but you don't identify the method with the</p> <p>18 hypothesis.</p> <p>19 Q Well, again, because there is no scientific</p> <p>20 way to prove what science is -- what natural science</p> <p>21 is; is that correct?</p> <p>22 MR. WILCOX: Objection.</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

16 (Pages 61 to 64)

<p>61</p> <p>1 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>2 Q It's a self-limiting -- it's what scientists</p> <p>3 themselves have decided to limit their inquiry in?</p> <p>4 A The method -- the establishment about the</p> <p>5 rules for science is not itself the product of</p> <p>6 science, but it's the foundation of science.</p> <p>7 Q Who devised this rule in the first place?</p> <p>8 A The -- the rules themselves came from the</p> <p>9 fruitfulness that resulted from the application of</p> <p>10 this method starting with people like Galileo who</p> <p>11 said, let's not use scripture; let's not resort to</p> <p>12 church authority; let's not resort to aristotelian</p> <p>13 ideas; let's resort to experiment and see what we can</p> <p>14 find out about the natural world.</p> <p>15 He found out lots of things about the</p> <p>16 natural world which philosophical, theological and</p> <p>17 other kinds of religious assumptions had not allowed</p> <p>18 us to see as clearly, and he set science, therefore,</p> <p>19 methodologically on a different sort of cognitional</p> <p>20 foundation from religions and philosophies.</p> <p>21 And what we're trying to do and what natural</p> <p>22 scientists are trying to do to this day is to preserve</p>	<p>63</p> <p>1 theory that will explain some of the complexities of</p> <p>2 the cellular structure that he examines; doesn't he</p> <p>3 have a right to do that?</p> <p>4 MR. WILCOX: Objection.</p> <p>5 THE WITNESS: He has the right as a</p> <p>6 person to widen the field of searching for the</p> <p>7 intelligibility of the world that he lives in. He</p> <p>8 does not have the endorsement of scientific -- the</p> <p>9 scientific community to bring in what most scientists</p> <p>10 consider to be a theological explanation to questions</p> <p>11 that still can be addressed and still have a whole</p> <p>12 future ahead of them in terms of further scientific</p> <p>13 specification. To do that as a scientist is</p> <p>14 objectionable. To do that as a person I do not</p> <p>15 consider that objectionable at all. In fact, I do</p> <p>16 that myself.</p> <p>17 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>18 Q Well, my question was what he was doing as a</p> <p>19 scientist. And I'm saying that he, as a scientist,</p> <p>20 decided that the theories that science uses, the</p> <p>21 materialism -- natural materialism cannot fully</p> <p>22 explain the things that he is seeing under the</p>
<p>62</p> <p>1 the purity of that empirical, experiential mode of</p> <p>2 inquiry that began with Galileo, especially, and</p> <p>3 earlier on Francis Bacon and others.</p> <p>4 Q Is this the same as methodological</p> <p>5 materialism?</p> <p>6 A You could say, I think, without objection</p> <p>7 that science is not only methodologically -- I would</p> <p>8 say physicalist, not materialist, because materialism</p> <p>9 is a term that is too crude to represent what</p> <p>10 scientists themselves are finding about the natural</p> <p>11 world. You could say it's methodologically reductive.</p> <p>12 You could say it's methodologically, even, atheistic</p> <p>13 in the sense that it does not allow for the</p> <p>14 introduction of theological terms, theological</p> <p>15 explanations in the self-limiting process of looking</p> <p>16 at the natural world in the manner of scientific</p> <p>17 method.</p> <p>18 Q Well, I guess the question, then, comes out,</p> <p>19 if a scientists like Michael Behe finds that this</p> <p>20 method cannot explain things like the bacterial</p> <p>21 flagellum, doesn't he have the right to say, well, the</p> <p>22 hypotheses now has to be something else and develop a</p>	<p>64</p> <p>1 microscope, so he is developing a new definition of</p> <p>2 science. As a scientist can he not challenge the</p> <p>3 hypotheses that the science community has propounded</p> <p>4 since the 17th century?</p> <p>5 A Everyone is free to define science the way</p> <p>6 they want to, but the way in which 99 percent, I would</p> <p>7 say, of the scientific community understands science</p> <p>8 is violated by his proposal that science itself can</p> <p>9 resort to the hypothesis of intelligent design.</p> <p>10 That's not the business of science itself to do that.</p> <p>11 As a person, as someone interested in truth,</p> <p>12 as someone interested in wider explanation, I</p> <p>13 personally believe that he's certainly justified in</p> <p>14 doing that, but he's not -- he should not present this</p> <p>15 as scientific inquiry but as a philosophical and</p> <p>16 theological inquiry.</p> <p>17 Q What he is looking at, the bacterial</p> <p>18 flagellum, the cilium and some other -- the eye and</p> <p>19 saying that this is evidence of design, is he not?</p> <p>20 A Yes.</p> <p>21 Q And because it's evidence of design, there</p> <p>22 had to be an intelligent designer. That's his theory.</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

17 (Pages 65 to 68)

<p>65</p> <p>1 A That's his theory.</p> <p>2 Q I'm not saying you agree with that.</p> <p>3 A It's not a scientific theory, but it's his</p> <p>4 belief.</p> <p>5 Q Now, evolutionists on the other hand will</p> <p>6 look at it and say, yes, it does have the appearance</p> <p>7 of design, do they not?</p> <p>8 A Evolutionists, many of them, at least, would</p> <p>9 say that many of the phenomena in life give the</p> <p>10 appearance of design.</p> <p>11 Q But they will say that that design is not</p> <p>12 by -- not caused by an intelligent designer, but</p> <p>13 caused by natural selection, will they not?</p> <p>14 A Let me make some distinctions here.</p> <p>15 Q Okay.</p> <p>16 A When they -- when they claim that</p> <p>17 intelligence or wisdom was not a factor at all,</p> <p>18 absolutely absent in the bringing about of natural</p> <p>19 phenomena, that's a philosophical, a quasi-theological</p> <p>20 statement. They, too, scientists themselves, in the</p> <p>21 same way that intelligent design advocates, sometimes</p> <p>22 slip into philosophical and metaphysical statements.</p>	<p>67</p> <p>1 explanation, which is the appropriate thing to bring</p> <p>2 out in scientific classrooms.</p> <p>3 Q Why don't you name some of the evolutionists</p> <p>4 or Darwinists who subscribe to the idea that natural</p> <p>5 selection explains all?</p> <p>6 A Yes, there are many, but the most -- the</p> <p>7 most well known is Richard Dawkins. He has quite a</p> <p>8 few followers in the scientific community; E.O.</p> <p>9 Wilson, Michael Ruse, Michael Rose. I think I would</p> <p>10 say probably, although I can't be sure of this because</p> <p>11 I haven't read his books, that Nigel Franks might be</p> <p>12 inclined to that direction. But, again, I object just</p> <p>13 as much to the absolutism and metaphysical assumptions</p> <p>14 of these people because they, too, are leaving science</p> <p>15 behind when they make these statements. They're</p> <p>16 speaking as philosophers.</p> <p>17 Whenever somebody says that science is the</p> <p>18 only road to truth, for example, that's a metaphysical</p> <p>19 statement or it's a belief, not something that's</p> <p>20 scientifically provable. Whenever anybody says that</p> <p>21 Darwinian mechanisms are the sole, final and deepest</p> <p>22 ultimate explanation of living phenomena, that's not a</p>
<p>66</p> <p>1 There is no basis in science itself for</p> <p>2 either including or excluding the notion of</p> <p>3 intelligent design as the ultimate explanation of</p> <p>4 phenomena. That's my own opinion.</p> <p>5 Q But there are several prominent Darwinists</p> <p>6 who do say that the total explanation of this item</p> <p>7 looking like design is natural selection?</p> <p>8 A In my book Deeper Than Darwin I take to task</p> <p>9 not only intelligent design advocates but many of the</p> <p>10 scientific community who themselves slip into such</p> <p>11 metaphysical and empirically unsupportable statements</p> <p>12 as to say that Darwinian mechanisms alone are</p> <p>13 sufficient to explain totally and exhaustively natural</p> <p>14 phenomena. When they say that, my emphasis is that is</p> <p>15 not a scientific statement but a philosophical or a</p> <p>16 metaphysical assumption.</p> <p>17 However, the answer for that is not to</p> <p>18 propose another ideology, which is what intelligent</p> <p>19 design does. When intelligent design -- people talk</p> <p>20 about balance treatment in the classroom. What</p> <p>21 they're trying to balance is one ideology with another</p> <p>22 that evades the whole discussion of scientific</p>	<p>68</p> <p>1 scientific statement. That's a metaphysical,</p> <p>2 quasi-religious statement. That does not belong in</p> <p>3 the classroom either.</p> <p>4 Q If someone says -- or if a book, a biology</p> <p>5 textbook says that living things develop randomly and</p> <p>6 by chance, is that a metaphysical statement?</p> <p>7 A No. It could be. It could be either a</p> <p>8 metaphysical statement or a scientific statement.</p> <p>9 When they say this scientifically, what they mean is</p> <p>10 that there's no observable direction or source of</p> <p>11 direction of certain phenomena that happen in nature.</p> <p>12 They are stochastic -- that's S-T-O-C-H-A-S-T-I-C --</p> <p>13 phenomena or phenomena that occur without any</p> <p>14 specifiable directionality, intelligent or otherwise.</p> <p>15 Q What about if they use the word undirected?</p> <p>16 A Undirected is what they mean when they say</p> <p>17 random, especially in evolutionary theory.</p> <p>18 Q Isn't that a statement that there is no God?</p> <p>19 A No, not necessarily at all. It's -- in</p> <p>20 fact, in my own theology the whole idea of a loving</p> <p>21 God requires a universe in which accidents are</p> <p>22 plentiful, and even St. Thomas Aquinas back in the</p>



DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

18 (Pages 69 to 72)

<p>69</p> <p>1 13th century said that from a theological point of</p> <p>2 view a world without accidents is inconceivable</p> <p>3 because try to imagine a world without accidents. It</p> <p>4 would be so frozen, so stiff, so deterministic</p> <p>5 everything would have been settled from the very</p> <p>6 beginning. Such a universe would be a puppet in the</p> <p>7 hands of God rather than a universe distinct from God.</p> <p>8 So in many ways what we call accidents,</p> <p>9 random events or philosophically contingent events,</p> <p>10 these events are completely consistent with the notion</p> <p>11 of a God who wants the universe to develop into</p> <p>12 something that can dialogue with God rather than be</p> <p>13 simply a passive, patty in the hands of the creator.</p> <p>14 Q So God would not know what is going to</p> <p>15 happen?</p> <p>16 A It's quite possible that the creator is</p> <p>17 waiting to be surprised and takes delight in what</p> <p>18 happens in the universe. This is a theological</p> <p>19 position that not everybody would accept, but it is</p> <p>20 one that has been accepted by a number of different</p> <p>21 theologians.</p> <p>22 Q So God can be surprised? Is it -- I mean,</p>	<p>71</p> <p>1 well, God does control everything, and God's</p> <p>2 foreknowledge has predestined everything to be what it</p> <p>3 is.</p> <p>4 In many ways the encounter with evolutionary</p> <p>5 thought in the last century and a half has caused a</p> <p>6 kind of re-thinking on the part of many theologians of</p> <p>7 what God is, and this is one of the things that I</p> <p>8 develop in my book God After Darwin.</p> <p>9 Q Could you describe the discipline of</p> <p>10 theology?</p> <p>11 A Theology is systematic reflection usually</p> <p>12 employing philosophical conceptualities to articulate</p> <p>13 the meaning of religious faith.</p> <p>14 Q And when you say systematic theology, is</p> <p>15 that a subdiscipline in theology or is that just a</p> <p>16 description in general of theology?</p> <p>17 A There is systematic theology. There's</p> <p>18 practical theology or ethics, and there's historical</p> <p>19 theology, and there are subdisciplines in those as</p> <p>20 well. But what ties them all together is they are</p> <p>21 attempts to understand religion and the object of</p> <p>22 religious devotion, God, in a way that moves beyond</p>
<p>70</p> <p>1 it's your theory or your opinion God can be surprised?</p> <p>2 A It's not just my opinion. It's a position</p> <p>3 which has been developed by a number of contemporary</p> <p>4 theologians including some evangelicals.</p> <p>5 Q So the concept or a characteristic of a God</p> <p>6 as all-knowing is not an adequate explanation, then?</p> <p>7 A I haven't denied the existence of an</p> <p>8 all-knowing God. God knows whatever can be known.</p> <p>9 Q But he doesn't know accidents?</p> <p>10 A I don't know how deeply you want me to get</p> <p>11 into theology here, but since you asked me, a God who</p> <p>12 knows everything, as the medieval theologians would</p> <p>13 say -- and there was a big discussion of this in the</p> <p>14 Middle Ages which was never resolved between the</p> <p>15 Banezians and the Molinists, and finally a pope</p> <p>16 stepped in and said the Jesuits and Dominicans should</p> <p>17 stop fighting about this issue.</p> <p>18 But it was never resolved, and today the</p> <p>19 discussion that's happening between those that think</p> <p>20 God knows all, and, therefore, controls everything is</p> <p>21 inconsistent with the God of love; there are those who</p> <p>22 say this. And then there are others who say that,</p>	<p>72</p> <p>1 spontaneous or what we call naive, symbolic or mythic</p> <p>2 religious understanding.</p> <p>3 Q So the issues that get into God, touch upon</p> <p>4 God, then you would say would be the area that</p> <p>5 theologians should discuss or should be involved with?</p> <p>6 A Not -- not necessarily just theologians.</p> <p>7 Everyone has the opportunity and the right to reflect</p> <p>8 on the meaning of the idea of God.</p> <p>9 Q I'm talking about the various academic</p> <p>10 disciplines, though. It seems to me as you discuss</p> <p>11 what science is and then you discuss what theology is</p> <p>12 you're trying to make a demarcation --</p> <p>13 A No, I --</p> <p>14 Q -- that you move from science and you go up</p> <p>15 so far and then you have to now get into theology.</p> <p>16 A One of the things that systematic theology</p> <p>17 does is lay out or -- good -- what I would consider to</p> <p>18 be good systematic theology lays out distinctly the</p> <p>19 way in which theology is different from, say, the</p> <p>20 natural sciences and philosophy. And the difference</p> <p>21 consists theologically of the fact that the systematic</p> <p>22 thought that's involved here goes beyond what can be</p>



DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

19 (Pages 73 to 76)

<p>73</p> <p>1 known by science, and science methodologically</p> <p>2 speaking does not talk about God. Systematic theology</p> <p>3 talks about God in a formal sense, and because of that</p> <p>4 distinction -- it's because of that distinction that I</p> <p>5 am very sensitive to texts, books, articles by alleged</p> <p>6 scientists who suddenly slip into a theological mode</p> <p>7 of discourse that belongs to another discipline.</p> <p>8 Q If we had a powerful enough microscope and</p> <p>9 we looked at the smallest infinitesimal matter and we</p> <p>10 saw "Made by God" on that matter --</p> <p>11 A Uh-huh. Yes.</p> <p>12 Q -- would you say scientists have no right to</p> <p>13 look at that and make a conclusion that this was made</p> <p>14 by God?</p> <p>15 A Your assumption there is, I think, erroneous</p> <p>16 that by looking at the minutia of nature that we</p> <p>17 sometimes get down to the fundamental levels; of</p> <p>18 nature. Some scientists make that same -- have that</p> <p>19 same assumption, which I think is an erroneous one.</p> <p>20 You're talking about a kind of physics which</p> <p>21 isolates the most basic or the most minute aspects of</p> <p>22 nature, but science is really -- that kind of approach</p>	<p>75</p> <p>1 people are doing.</p> <p>2 Q So what is the big deal about what is</p> <p>3 science and what is not? If you're all seeking --</p> <p>4 A The big --</p> <p>5 Q -- the truth --</p> <p>6 A -- deal --</p> <p>7 Q If you're all seeking the truth, why do we</p> <p>8 have to say, well, this is science and this is</p> <p>9 theology, this is philosophy, this is chemistry?</p> <p>10 A The big deal is that science quite rightly</p> <p>11 seeks to have a future, to have indefinite horizons of</p> <p>12 exploration ahead of it. This is what excites</p> <p>13 scientists. This is what gets them up in the morning.</p> <p>14 To bring in an ultimate explanation, a</p> <p>15 theological explanation here and now at this moment in</p> <p>16 the history of scientific inquiry is implicitly to</p> <p>17 tell the scientists your work is done; we have finally</p> <p>18 figured out what is the ultimate and final explanation</p> <p>19 for your study of natural phenomena.</p> <p>20 And what theology -- what good theology</p> <p>21 should do is open up and support the scientific search</p> <p>22 for endless horizons of understanding; for example,</p>
<p>74</p> <p>1 actually abstracts from, leaves out all the rest of</p> <p>2 reality. So it's not even conceivable that that kind</p> <p>3 of approach would ever find at that level that you're</p> <p>4 talking about anything that says, "Made by God."</p> <p>5 Now, it's possible that as you step out of</p> <p>6 the shoes of strict science as a human being</p> <p>7 interested in the deeper truths of reality that you</p> <p>8 will arrive at that conclusion, and I think quite</p> <p>9 legitimately, but you don't bring in "Made by God"</p> <p>10 while you're doing science.</p> <p>11 Q Well, but that's the question I -- the</p> <p>12 reason I asked that question is to see how far this</p> <p>13 demarcation would go, what is science and what is not.</p> <p>14 When you say it's not conceivable, we don't know what</p> <p>15 science is going to find out in the next ten years, do</p> <p>16 we?</p> <p>17 A We know this; that science is not wired,</p> <p>18 let's put it that way, as a detection system. Science</p> <p>19 is not wired to pick up any signals of transcendence</p> <p>20 of God. Now, if you want to rewire science to pick</p> <p>21 that up, what you have done is slipped into theology,</p> <p>22 and this, I think, is what the intelligent design</p>	<p>76</p> <p>1 simply to say that irreducible complexity is caused by</p> <p>2 an intelligent design has the effect of being what's</p> <p>3 called a science-stopper. It seems to make irrelevant</p> <p>4 any further scientific, physical understanding or</p> <p>5 evolutionary understanding of how these phenomena</p> <p>6 could have come about.</p> <p>7 Q Well, Michael Behe believes in intelligent</p> <p>8 design yet he continues to do his lab work; isn't that</p> <p>9 correct? Isn't that right?</p> <p>10 A You see, I don't know whether he's doing</p> <p>11 that or not. I have -- I have the sense that what</p> <p>12 Behe is doing is implicitly theological when he</p> <p>13 resorts to the notion of intelligent design, and</p> <p>14 perhaps that belief, which I think is perhaps</p> <p>15 ultimately correct that somehow intelligence lies</p> <p>16 behind the phenomenon, can have the effect of</p> <p>17 energizing science. So theology, a theological sense</p> <p>18 that there is some ultimate rationality that</p> <p>19 undergirds the whole of the natural world, can have,</p> <p>20 and I think has had, the effect of, in a sense,</p> <p>21 legitimating the whole scientific enterprise by</p> <p>22 telling scientist, go for it, there's rationality out</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

20 (Pages 77 to 80)

<p>77</p> <p>1 there. If a scientist said deep in his gut, there's</p> <p>2 no rationality out there, then there would be no</p> <p>3 incentive to seek further clarification of this</p> <p>4 rationality.</p> <p>5 My point is not that it's wrong to appeal to</p> <p>6 the notion of intelligent design or intelligence,</p> <p>7 rather. I would not say intelligent design. I don't</p> <p>8 like the term design. It's not wrong, and it's even</p> <p>9 energizing, I think, to the scientific enterprise to</p> <p>10 appeal to the notion of intelligence as the ultimate</p> <p>11 foundation of reality. Again, I would say wisdom</p> <p>12 rather than intelligence because that opens up the</p> <p>13 possibility -- the prospect that we can keep on going</p> <p>14 deeper and deeper into this intelligibility.</p> <p>15 The problem is that the intelligent design</p> <p>16 people want to bring that intelligence into science</p> <p>17 itself rather than making that intelligence the</p> <p>18 ultimate foundation of reality.</p> <p>19 Q Well --</p> <p>20 A And that's -- that's why I think it's so</p> <p>21 important to distinguish between scientific method and</p> <p>22 systematic theology or theology of any stripe.</p>	<p>79</p> <p>1 in that particular biological structure.</p> <p>2 A Well, evolutionists themselves do reverse --</p> <p>3 MR. WILCOX: Excuse me. There was no</p> <p>4 question.</p> <p>5 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>6 Q Isn't that true?</p> <p>7 MR. THOMPSON: Thank you.</p> <p>8 MR. WILCOX: Isn't which true?</p> <p>9 THE WITNESS: Yes, it's true. They can</p> <p>10 do reverse engineering, but so also do evolutionary</p> <p>11 biologists. That's not really controversial in</p> <p>12 itself.</p> <p>13 What is controversial is they're taking</p> <p>14 an assumption which can be the intellectual and</p> <p>15 cultural context for scientific inquiry -- they're</p> <p>16 taking their assumption that intelligence or</p> <p>17 rationality underlies the totality of nature. They're</p> <p>18 taking that assumption and they're making that part of</p> <p>19 science rather than foundational to the science.</p> <p>20 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>21 Q As I recall in your book, I think Deeper</p> <p>22 Than -- Deeper Than -- Deeper Than Darwin --</p>
<p>78</p> <p>1 Q Intelligent design theorists can conclude</p> <p>2 there is intelligent design without going into the</p> <p>3 characteristics of the designer; is that correct?</p> <p>4 MR. WILCOX: Other than that there's an</p> <p>5 assumed intelligence?</p> <p>6 THE WITNESS: Yes. In fact, this is</p> <p>7 why I think their thought is so theological; they're</p> <p>8 appealing to something that they can't get their minds</p> <p>9 around. That's why I call it religious.</p> <p>10 I define religious in my report in</p> <p>11 three different ways, and the appeal to intelligence,</p> <p>12 as your question suggested, is the appeal to something</p> <p>13 that is indefinable; whereas what science itself tries</p> <p>14 to do is define causes as much as it possibly can.</p> <p>15 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>16 Q Well, if a scientist says something is</p> <p>17 designed -- intelligently designed and that scientist</p> <p>18 then goes out and figures out what the design is, as</p> <p>19 Bill Dembski says, then they can do some reverse</p> <p>20 engineering; is that correct?</p> <p>21 A Yes.</p> <p>22 Q And then correct whatever flaw they perceive</p>	<p>80</p> <p>1 A Uh-huh.</p> <p>2 Q -- you discuss the analogy of reading a --</p> <p>3 reading Moby Dick?</p> <p>4 A Yes.</p> <p>5 Q Okay. And you have a monkey try to do it</p> <p>6 and you have a two-year-old child, a 14-year-old and a</p> <p>7 mature adult.</p> <p>8 A Right.</p> <p>9 Q Everyone is reading the same book --</p> <p>10 A Right.</p> <p>11 Q -- and they're getting different meanings</p> <p>12 from it --</p> <p>13 A Right.</p> <p>14 Q -- correct?</p> <p>15 A They're reading at different methodological</p> <p>16 levels.</p> <p>17 Q At a different level?</p> <p>18 A Uh-huh.</p> <p>19 Q And from that I got that, you know, the</p> <p>20 scientists read the book at a certain level --</p> <p>21 A The book of nature.</p> <p>22 Q The book of nature at a certain level, and</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

21 (Pages 81 to 84)

<p>81</p> <p>1 then that's as far as they can go --</p> <p>2 A As scientists.</p> <p>3 Q -- as scientists, and then you go to the</p> <p>4 next level, which I assume is theology or</p> <p>5 metaphysical -- metaphysical level?</p> <p>6 A Let me just explain that. In order to move</p> <p>7 from one level of adequacy -- one reading level to the</p> <p>8 other, I believe as a theologian that you need to</p> <p>9 undergo a personal transformation and not just a</p> <p>10 sharpening of your wits in order to be sensitive to</p> <p>11 the deepest levels -- what I consider to be the</p> <p>12 deepest levels of reality, including divine</p> <p>13 creativity. But that -- that personal transformation</p> <p>14 is something that moves you from one level to the</p> <p>15 other; it's not something that should be brought in as</p> <p>16 a characteristic at a particular reading level like</p> <p>17 that of science.</p> <p>18 Q And, as I understand, your criticism is that</p> <p>19 intelligent design theorists bring in the concept of</p> <p>20 intelligent design too early in the game?</p> <p>21 A Yes. And, in effect, they are saying to</p> <p>22 their fellow scientists, you should go through the</p>	<p>83</p> <p>1 there are 40 different moving parts and this concept</p> <p>2 of irreducible complexity could not have been achieved</p> <p>3 by natural selection. There would have been no</p> <p>4 improvement in the bacterial flagellum and its purpose</p> <p>5 until the whole thing came together at one time.</p> <p>6 There was not an adaptive process that could have</p> <p>7 created this. Isn't that his theory?</p> <p>8 A He is making an improper either/or. He's</p> <p>9 saying that this phenomenon, this irreducible</p> <p>10 complexity, came about by intelligent design rather</p> <p>11 than by natural processes.</p> <p>12 Q But that's the point. He is -- that is his</p> <p>13 conclusion after looking at the empirical data. It is</p> <p>14 not looking at the Bible.</p> <p>15 A Right.</p> <p>16 Q It is not looking at the magisterium of the</p> <p>17 church. It is looking at the bacterial flagellum</p> <p>18 under a powerful microscope. Isn't that true?</p> <p>19 A He's starting --</p> <p>20 MR. WILCOX: Objection. Isn't which</p> <p>21 true?</p> <p>22 MR. THOMPSON: All of the above.</p>
<p>82</p> <p>1 same kind of personal transformation that led me to</p> <p>2 the idea, to the belief, that there is some ultimate</p> <p>3 rationality that underlies this process. That's not</p> <p>4 fair to scientists. Science as science is not in the</p> <p>5 business of religious conversion.</p> <p>6 Q But Michael Behe is looking at the bacterial</p> <p>7 flagellum and coming to the conclusion that this is a</p> <p>8 machine that has an intelligent design?</p> <p>9 A Yes, he is doing that but --</p> <p>10 Q Okay. So it is not a --</p> <p>11 A But he's doing it -- that is exactly what I</p> <p>12 mean by a shift from one level of reading to another.</p> <p>13 Whereas at the level of reading that's appropriate to</p> <p>14 science, the level of reading of nature, making sense</p> <p>15 of nature, the kind of personal transformation as a</p> <p>16 Roman Catholic that allowed Michael Behe so easily to</p> <p>17 say, and perhaps quite rightly to say, that there's</p> <p>18 some ultimate rationality that underlies this process,</p> <p>19 that statement, that process, is not part of science</p> <p>20 itself. That's something that's extrascientific.</p> <p>21 Q But he is looking at the empirical data. He</p> <p>22 is looking at the bacterial flagellum saying that</p>	<p>84</p> <p>1 MR. WILCOX: Then I object as compound.</p> <p>2 MR. THOMPSON: Okay.</p> <p>3 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>4 Q Isn't it true that he comes to that</p> <p>5 conclusion by looking at the bacterial flagellum under</p> <p>6 the microscope?</p> <p>7 A Every good theologian, and I'm not saying --</p> <p>8 Q Answer the question yes or no.</p> <p>9 MR. THOMPSON: Objection.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: Well, he's starting --</p> <p>11 yes, he's starting out by observing, but so does</p> <p>12 theology.</p> <p>13 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>14 Q Okay.</p> <p>15 A Theology starts out by observing empirically</p> <p>16 certain phenomena, and then it reasons -- in the terms</p> <p>17 of looking for an ultimate explanation of those</p> <p>18 phenomena it ultimately concludes that there has to be</p> <p>19 something extranatural, supernatural, but deeper than</p> <p>20 nature, to give it full explanation, and that's what</p> <p>21 Behe is doing. He's doing theology.</p> <p>22 Q He's looking at -- theologians, I don't</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

22 (Pages 85 to 88)

<p>85</p> <p>1 think, look at the bacterial flagellum, do they?</p> <p>2 A Of course we do.</p> <p>3 Q You do?</p> <p>4 A Natural theology has always looked along</p> <p>5 with science. Science can be very helpful to theology</p> <p>6 in detailing and reading the natural world.</p> <p>7 Q So when you look at the bacterial</p> <p>8 flagellum --</p> <p>9 A Uh-huh.</p> <p>10 Q -- you can come to the conclusion based on</p> <p>11 the empirical data that this machine could not have</p> <p>12 been -- could not have been caused by natural</p> <p>13 selection.</p> <p>14 MR. WILCOX: Objection. There's no</p> <p>15 question.</p> <p>16 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>17 Q Is that true?</p> <p>18 A Behe has drawn this conclusion. I would not</p> <p>19 because I do not make the distinction -- I do not see</p> <p>20 theology as in competition with science, with natural</p> <p>21 causes. In fact, as a theologian I want scientists to</p> <p>22 push natural explanations as far as they possibly can</p>	<p>87</p> <p>1 exhausted every possible physical, historical, natural</p> <p>2 explanation of that phenomena -- for that phenomenon.</p> <p>3 If they say that scientific method gets us</p> <p>4 to the ultimate explanation of this phenomenon, then</p> <p>5 they are making a quasi-theological statement. They</p> <p>6 are jumping out of scientific method themselves, as</p> <p>7 sometimes they do. That does not give the intelligent</p> <p>8 design people an excuse to bring in a quasi-religious</p> <p>9 answer to the question of how to explain that</p> <p>10 particular phenomenon like the flagellum too soon. To</p> <p>11 do so is to cut off that process of indefinitely</p> <p>12 expanding our natural understanding of phenomena.</p> <p>13 Q But the Darwinists say, we have a definition</p> <p>14 for it; it's natural selection.</p> <p>15 A Let me -- let me --</p> <p>16 Q Isn't that true? That's what they say; it's</p> <p>17 caused --</p> <p>18 A Yes.</p> <p>19 Q -- by natural selection?</p> <p>20 A Yes, and rightly so. Let me --</p> <p>21 Q Let me ask the question and you can answer</p> <p>22 the next question. But there's a disagreement between</p>
<p>86</p> <p>1 because they don't compete with one another.</p> <p>2 Q On the other hand, there are other</p> <p>3 scientists, other people in the biology field that</p> <p>4 will say, no, you see this design in this bacterial</p> <p>5 flagellum, but it's not -- it's merely chusory that</p> <p>6 this was done by or caused by natural selection; isn't</p> <p>7 that true?</p> <p>8 MR. THOMPSON: I'm sorry. Could you</p> <p>9 read that back? This may not be the question you</p> <p>10 meant to ask.</p> <p>11 (The Record was read as requested.)</p> <p>12 MR. THOMPSON: Right.</p> <p>13 THE WITNESS: That's a very confusing</p> <p>14 way of putting the question, I think.</p> <p>15 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>16 Q Simplify it.</p> <p>17 A Okay. As scientists following scientific</p> <p>18 method they are not permitted methodologically to</p> <p>19 bring in the notion of divine intelligence or</p> <p>20 intelligent design as an explanation, as a</p> <p>21 self-limiting way of looking at natural phenomena.</p> <p>22 What they are committed to is making sure that we have</p>	<p>88</p> <p>1 Behe and the evolutionists; isn't that true?</p> <p>2 A There's a difference between Behe and the</p> <p>3 evolutionists because Behe is not playing the game of</p> <p>4 science. He's slipping into another game. Let me</p> <p>5 explain.</p> <p>6 Q Well, I want to -- I have a follow-up</p> <p>7 question. So you think science is a game?</p> <p>8 A I'm using that as a metaphor. The game is</p> <p>9 something that has certain rules that one has to</p> <p>10 follow.</p> <p>11 Q Okay. Where were those rules developed?</p> <p>12 A Those rules --</p> <p>13 MR. WILCOX: Objection.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: -- were developed by a</p> <p>15 historical process of sifting and filtering out ways</p> <p>16 of learning and ways of discovery that are not</p> <p>17 fruitful in terms of opening up the universe to deeper</p> <p>18 and deeper exploration.</p> <p>19 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>20 Q But there are no -- there's not like the Ten</p> <p>21 Commandments handed down by some holy scripture that</p> <p>22 these are the rules that you have to play by, is</p>



DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

23 (Pages 89 to 92)

<p>89</p> <p>1 there?</p> <p>2 A No, but there are occasionally philosophers</p> <p>3 of science who are skilled in science who discuss</p> <p>4 these rules and who come to a certain sense of what</p> <p>5 constitutes good science.</p> <p>6 One philosopher does not always agree with</p> <p>7 the other, but what most philosophers of science do</p> <p>8 have in common is that science is not theology and</p> <p>9 that science has to have an empirical dimension, that</p> <p>10 is, experiential dimension rooted in our senses and in</p> <p>11 instruments that refine our sensible awareness; that</p> <p>12 have to try as far as possible to quantify things</p> <p>13 mathematically, and good scientists do this and good</p> <p>14 evolutionists do this, even good social scientists</p> <p>15 try --</p> <p>16 Q Let me stop you right there. Bill Dembski</p> <p>17 has attempted to do this with his probabilities.</p> <p>18 A Well, you have to have the right balance of</p> <p>19 empirical observation and mathematical organization.</p> <p>20 In my opinion you can be a great mathematician without</p> <p>21 having submitted yourself to the empirical imperative,</p> <p>22 and I think this is certainly true of all of the</p>	<p>91</p> <p>1 Q So your answer is, yes, there are gaps and</p> <p>2 problems in Darwin's Theory of Evolution?</p> <p>3 A What do you mean by "gap"?</p> <p>4 Q Things that he cannot explain.</p> <p>5 A Such as?</p> <p>6 Q How life began.</p> <p>7 A Can I give an example of --</p> <p>8 Q Well, answer my question.</p> <p>9 A -- with reference -- there are always things</p> <p>10 that science has not yet explained.</p> <p>11 Q And Darwin's Theory of Evolution has not</p> <p>12 explained?</p> <p>13 A There is much left in the living phenomena</p> <p>14 of life that needs further explanation beyond what</p> <p>15 Darwin has taught us.</p> <p>16 Q Well, you mentioned paleontology. Isn't</p> <p>17 there some problems there between the Cambrian</p> <p>18 explosion where all at once you see life figures and</p> <p>19 then disappearance; isn't that a problem for Darwin's</p> <p>20 theory?</p> <p>21 A There are always problems with collecting</p> <p>22 fossils because only one in, what, 5 billion bones</p>
<p>90</p> <p>1 intelligent design people.</p> <p>2 Q What is the empirical imperative?</p> <p>3 A To open your senses as much as possible to</p> <p>4 the data; for example, in evolution. Evolution is a</p> <p>5 theory that's made up of a number of observational</p> <p>6 disciplines such as paleontology; a comparative of</p> <p>7 that would be biogeographical explorations, genetics,</p> <p>8 radiometric dating. All of these are ideas that are</p> <p>9 found by opening our senses to the full range of the</p> <p>10 natural world. And without that empirical element,</p> <p>11 there would be no basis for evolution, so mathematics</p> <p>12 is not enough. But I think Dembski is very good at</p> <p>13 mathematics, at least my impression is, but like other</p> <p>14 intelligent design people, he's completely ignored the</p> <p>15 empirical data that is the basis for evolutionary</p> <p>16 theory in the scientific community.</p> <p>17 Q There are a lot of gaps and problems in</p> <p>18 Darwin's theory, is there not?</p> <p>19 A Every scientific theory, if it's a good</p> <p>20 scientific theory, leaves itself open to modification</p> <p>21 and to improvement, and that would certainly be true</p> <p>22 of Darwinian theory.</p>	<p>92</p> <p>1 ever gets fossilized. And there are apparently what</p> <p>2 people call gaps in the fossil record in the sense</p> <p>3 that one would expect perhaps more transitional forms,</p> <p>4 but we're filling these in especially --</p> <p>5 Q So --</p> <p>6 A -- with reference to --</p> <p>7 Q So there are gaps --</p> <p>8 MR. WILCOX: Excuse me. You're</p> <p>9 interrupting his answer.</p> <p>10 MR. THOMPSON: Okay. I'm sorry.</p> <p>11 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>12 Q So there are gaps --</p> <p>13 MR. WILCOX: Would you finish your</p> <p>14 answer?</p> <p>15 THE WITNESS: With reference to human</p> <p>16 phenomena, the gaps have been filled in fairly well.</p> <p>17 The evolution of humans has been detailed quite well</p> <p>18 by paleontologists. Whales, for example, during the</p> <p>19 Eocene, we're increasingly finding transitional forms</p> <p>20 there.</p> <p>21 The problem is that transitional</p> <p>22 forms -- whenever there is an experimentation with a</p>



DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

24 (Pages 93 to 96)

<p style="text-align: right;">93</p> <p>1 new kind of phenomenon, such as, for example, a new          2 automobile in human technology, there are only a few,          3 comparatively, attempts at -- at viable, adaptable          4 types of existence, and because of the falsity of data          5 at certain junctures in the fossil record, some          6 people, like the intelligent design people and          7 creationists, draw the conclusion that the Doctrine of          8 Special Creation by God is an alternative to the          9 evolutionary view of things.</p> <p>10 But you have to remember the Cambrian          11 explosion took place over a period of several million          12 years.</p> <p>13 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>14 Q Still a short span when you look at the          15 earth as 4 billion years old; is that correct?</p> <p>16 A Yes, and the theory of punctuated          17 equilibrium might be one approach to explaining how          18 that works.</p> <p>19 Q Well, the theory of punctuated equilibrium          20 is something that really is contrary to what Darwin          21 thought; is that correct?</p> <p>22 A Darwin did not, as far as I know, have a</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">95</p> <p>1 from any known species, but the primates, chimpanzees,          2 baboons, monkeys and so forth and we have a common          3 ancestor, and the record of that is found in the human          4 genome itself.</p> <p>5 Q Who is the common ancestor?</p> <p>6 A Who --</p> <p>7 Q Yeah, or what.</p> <p>8 A -- or what?</p> <p>9 Q Yeah.</p> <p>10 A Yeah, we haven't found that yet.</p> <p>11 Q So that's a weakness in Darwin's theory?</p> <p>12 MR. WILCOX: Objection.</p> <p>13 THE WITNESS: No, it's not a weakness.</p> <p>14 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>15 Q So you don't have to explain that?</p> <p>16 A We still don't have the answer to the          17 question of how to unify the electromagnetic with          18 weak, strong and gravitational forces either. That's          19 a weakness you might say in physics, but it's one that          20 opens up the possibility of further specification;          21 likewise, with evolution, evolution is a good science          22 because it's open to further progress in</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">94</p> <p>1 definitive position on that. He was aware that the          2 fossil record is spotty, but it was enough -- there          3 was enough directionality there as you move from the          4 lowest levels of fossil record to higher complexity          5 increases.</p> <p>6 Q But he thought everything would be very slow          7 and gradual; isn't that correct?</p> <p>8 A Right, as all evolutionists do.</p> <p>9 Q Right. But punctuated equilibrium is          10 contrary to that slow and gradual process?</p> <p>11 A It's slow -- it's faster, but it's still          12 very slow. 2 million years is a long time.</p> <p>13 Q Not when there's 4 billion years; is that          14 correct?</p> <p>15 A The development of the human brain from our          16 hominid ancestors took place over a very small period          17 of time, comparatively just several million years. So          18 there can be kind of runaway processes that do occur          19 at times, but they don't in any way violate the laws          20 of natural selection.</p> <p>21 Q Which animal did the humans come from?</p> <p>22 A We have a common ancestor. We did not come</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">96</p> <p>1 understanding.</p> <p>2 Q Well, would you say -- if you don't want to          3 use the word weakness, would you say there's a gap in          4 Darwin's theory, then?</p> <p>5 A It's -- it's -- I would say -- I wouldn't          6 use the term gap. I would say it's the knowable          7 unknown that still remains in Darwin's theory.</p> <p>8 Q Well, I'm quoting from the biology textbook          9 that the high school students are using in Dover, and          10 it says, Research still debates such important          11 questions as precisely how new species arise and why          12 species become extinct. There's also uncertainty          13 about how life began.</p> <p>14 Do you agree with that?</p> <p>15 A Yes, oh, of course.</p> <p>16 Q Okay. Does Darwin's theory explain how life          17 came out of matter?</p> <p>18 A Darwinian theory doesn't do that, but you          19 can explain biochemically, but you can also explain it          20 at different levels. I would want to leave room for a          21 theological explanation of life, but, you see, a          22 theological explanation of life does not compete with</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

26 (Pages 101 to 104)

<p>101</p> <p>1 MR. WILCOX: Objection.</p> <p>2 THE WITNESS: I don't think so</p> <p>3 personally, no.</p> <p>4 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>5 Q Well, isn't it true that the fossil evidence</p> <p>6 suggests that many of the phyla first appeared without</p> <p>7 evident precursors over the five to ten million years</p> <p>8 that we're talking about in the Cambrian rocks?</p> <p>9 A Without precursors being detected so far,</p> <p>10 possibly so.</p> <p>11 Q Okay. So that --</p> <p>12 A By the way, when you say -- could I ask for</p> <p>13 a clarification?</p> <p>14 Q Sure.</p> <p>15 A When you say weakness in Darwinian theory,</p> <p>16 that's a bit vague, too, because what today is known</p> <p>17 as Darwinian theory is not exactly the same thing as</p> <p>18 Darwin himself held. There have been a lot of</p> <p>19 developments in evolutionary theory supported</p> <p>20 especially by genetics. So when people refer to</p> <p>21 Darwinian evolution today, they're referring to a much</p> <p>22 richer understanding of life than Darwin himself had.</p>	<p>103</p> <p>1 at the data.</p> <p>2 A Right.</p> <p>3 Q And the data is missing right now.</p> <p>4 A That's -- the empirical imperative directs</p> <p>5 us to look for as much data as we possibly can.</p> <p>6 Q And we haven't found the data as it relates</p> <p>7 to the Cambrian explosion; is that correct?</p> <p>8 A We found lots of data that relate to the</p> <p>9 Cambrian explosion.</p> <p>10 Q No. I mean that relate to the precursors to</p> <p>11 the phyla that were found in the Cambrian explosion.</p> <p>12 A Again, I'm -- I'm not as much of an expert</p> <p>13 in this as biologists -- formal biologists are, but my</p> <p>14 own understanding is that there are precursors to the</p> <p>15 kind of explosion that took place in the Cambrian</p> <p>16 explosion; although, they were not as explosive, let's</p> <p>17 say, as you find in the Cambrian explosion. There has</p> <p>18 been a general directional transformation of living</p> <p>19 stuff into more and more complex forms of living stuff</p> <p>20 over the process of 3.8 billion years.</p> <p>21 Q And what were the precursors to the Cambrian</p> <p>22 fauna, then. You say there were. What were they?</p>
<p>102</p> <p>1 Q And we'll get into, you know, the full</p> <p>2 explanation of Darwin's theory, but there is this</p> <p>3 weakness that we can't find the precursors to the</p> <p>4 animal phyla that first appeared in the Cambrian</p> <p>5 rocks; is that correct?</p> <p>6 A Again, I would not call that a weakness. I</p> <p>7 would say that's a territory to be explored.</p> <p>8 Q Okay. Is it a gap?</p> <p>9 A Every science -- every science has a</p> <p>10 weakness in the sense that no science has ever wrapped</p> <p>11 up fully and bottled and capped its field of inquiry;</p> <p>12 it's an ongoing process of specification and detail.</p> <p>13 And Darwinian theory, like any other scientific</p> <p>14 theory, has a long way to go in terms of its future</p> <p>15 discoveries.</p> <p>16 Q Well, would you indicate that that's --</p> <p>17 there's a lack of evidence in that that supports</p> <p>18 Darwin's theory?</p> <p>19 A I would not say evidence. I would say</p> <p>20 there's room for increasing data. Data is not exactly</p> <p>21 formally the same thing as evidence.</p> <p>22 Q Well, if we're scientists, we have to look</p>	<p>104</p> <p>1 A I don't recall, but I recall reading</p> <p>2 recently in some scientific publication that the</p> <p>3 Cambrian explosion is not an absolute beginning of</p> <p>4 biological complexity.</p> <p>5 Q Do you regard the Cambrian explosion as a</p> <p>6 challenge to common descent?</p> <p>7 A Oh, not at all.</p> <p>8 Q When you see so many different phyla all at</p> <p>9 once appear?</p> <p>10 A We might be descendants of one of those</p> <p>11 phyla without being the descendants of others. But</p> <p>12 those phyla themselves, you see, were descendants of,</p> <p>13 ultimately, probably one unicellular form of life that</p> <p>14 originated as much as 4 billion years ago.</p> <p>15 Q Have we found that unicellular form of life?</p> <p>16 A You're never going to find it directly</p> <p>17 because it's gone, but you can reason to it on the</p> <p>18 basis of our understanding of genetics and metabolism</p> <p>19 and other kinds of physical processes that have formed</p> <p>20 the building blocks of living stuff ever since.</p> <p>21 Q So you can utilize reason to take the place</p> <p>22 of actual data?</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

27 (Pages 105 to 108)

<p>105</p> <p>1 A In science reason doesn't take the place of</p> <p>2 data; reason organizes the data into intelligible</p> <p>3 structures.</p> <p>4 Q Okay. So what is wrong with reason</p> <p>5 organizing the bacterial flagellum into intelligent</p> <p>6 design?</p> <p>7 A Nothing's wrong with that provided you don't</p> <p>8 call that science. It's more of a theological and</p> <p>9 philosophical reasoning. There are different levels,</p> <p>10 as I was explaining to you while ago, of formally</p> <p>11 structuring data, and the way in which theology and</p> <p>12 philosophy structure their data in such a way as to</p> <p>13 constitute material for that kind of discourse is such</p> <p>14 as to bring in, for example, to use an aristotelian</p> <p>15 term, notions of formal and final causality that are</p> <p>16 left out in scientific inquiry.</p> <p>17 Q Do you have any idea at all what phyla the</p> <p>18 octopus belongs to?</p> <p>19 A No, I don't.</p> <p>20 Q What about the starfish?</p> <p>21 A No, I don't know that. I don't have that</p> <p>22 detailed knowledge of biology.</p>	<p>107</p> <p>1 evolved more gradually, and in most cases, I believe,</p> <p>2 they performed — the precursors of these allegedly</p> <p>3 irreducible — irreducibly complex phenomena performed</p> <p>4 functions that are quite different from and perhaps</p> <p>5 unrelated to the particular function that the</p> <p>6 flagellum and its rotary motor perform now.</p> <p>7 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>8 Q Do you accept those explanations?</p> <p>9 A I'm not a scientist, but I want — what I</p> <p>10 want to accept is the openness of scientific inquiry</p> <p>11 to push those gradualistic explanations as far as they</p> <p>12 possibly can go.</p> <p>13 Now, it should be said that there are other</p> <p>14 sciences that are supportive of biology that allow for</p> <p>15 the self-organization of material processes in ways</p> <p>16 that Darwin and even perhaps some contemporary</p> <p>17 Darwinian biologists are not fully apprised of.</p> <p>18 Stuart Kauffman, for example, has written a lot about</p> <p>19 the self-organizing character of material processes</p> <p>20 that could perhaps have a subordinate or at least a</p> <p>21 complementary explanatory role in explaining what Behe</p> <p>22 refers to as irreducible complexity. But, you see,</p>
<p>106</p> <p>1 Q Isn't it true that Darwin himself remarked</p> <p>2 that if it could be demonstrated that some complex</p> <p>3 structure could not possibly have come about by</p> <p>4 numerous, successive, slight modifications that his</p> <p>5 theory would absolutely break down?</p> <p>6 A Darwin himself did say that.</p> <p>7 Q Yes. And would Michael Behe's description</p> <p>8 and conclusions relating to the bacterial flagellum</p> <p>9 then be responsible for the breakdown of Darwin's</p> <p>10 theory?</p> <p>11 A Well, as I said a while ago, Darwinian</p> <p>12 theory today is not the same thing as Darwin himself</p> <p>13 thought evolution to be, so let's say evolutionary</p> <p>14 biology — I would say the flagellum does not cause</p> <p>15 the breakdown of evolutionary biology.</p> <p>16 Q Has there been any explanation in</p> <p>17 evolutionary biology for the complex — the</p> <p>18 irreducibly complex bacterial flagellum?</p> <p>19 MR. WILCOX: Objection.</p> <p>20 THE WITNESS: A number of biologists</p> <p>21 have responded to Behe by proposing ways in which</p> <p>22 these allegedly irreducible phenomena could have</p>	<p>108</p> <p>1 these are scientific ideas, not theological ideas.</p> <p>2 Q And they're really just guesses at this</p> <p>3 point, are they not?</p> <p>4 A In studying any historical phenomenon,</p> <p>5 whether it's human history or natural history, a lot</p> <p>6 of our present understanding has to be hypothetical.</p> <p>7 Q As that also applies to Darwin's Theory of</p> <p>8 Evolution?</p> <p>9 A It applies to every theory including</p> <p>10 Darwin's Theory of Evolution.</p> <p>11 Q I'm trying to find the exact quote, but at</p> <p>12 some point in your book Deeper Than Darwin you</p> <p>13 basically criticize the evolutionists — some group of</p> <p>14 evolutionists who came up with a lot of stories,</p> <p>15 metaphoric descriptions about particular events which</p> <p>16 was not truly science. Do you remember that part in</p> <p>17 the book?</p> <p>18 A I don't think I criticized the so-called</p> <p>19 "just so" stories. I criticized other aspects of</p> <p>20 evolutionary thought in the wider sense. Evolutionary</p> <p>21 materialism is really what I criticize, which is not</p> <p>22 really science but another form of belief system.</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

28 (Pages 109 to 112)

<p>109</p> <p>1 Q Right. I'll try to find that because it  2 might be in a different article that you wrote.  3 What factors would you consider have to be  4 present for something to be a science?  5 A There has to be observation -- an  6 observational method which obeys what I called earlier  7 the empirical imperative; to open our minds as far as  8 possible and our senses as far as possible to the  9 world around us, there has to be that. That's not  10 enough by itself. There have to be frameworks for  11 organizing that data into hypotheses and eventually  12 theories. These are conceptual and usually  13 mathematical. And, thirdly, there has to be an  14 obedience to the imperative to be critical; there has  15 to be a willingness to persistently examine whether  16 your hypotheses and theories correspond to the data.  17 So those three ingredients.  18 Q Okay. Are there any others?  19 A There are -- there are factors that are  20 present in what I would call a subscientific way that  21 I mentioned earlier. There have to be -- for example,  22 there has to be a belief on the part of the scientist</p>	<p>111</p> <p>1 skill that requires a certain asceticism on the part  2 of the human mind that it will refrain from doing  3 certain things or having certain preoccupations while  4 you're doing science.  5 Symbolized by the white coat, we purify our  6 minds of desires for our experiments to conform to  7 what's necessary to get tenure or whatever in the  8 university. We have to learn that skill, and it's --  9 as I say, it's a kind of asceticism, a discipline,  10 that doesn't come automatically but requires a  11 training process within a community which has a  12 certain authority structure to it, not unlike  13 religious communities. In the wide sense there are  14 certain rules that one has to learn and apply, and if  15 one disobeys those rules, then one is not considered  16 part of this community.  17 And one of the rules of this community which  18 we call science is that we should not resort to  19 aristotelian final causes in order to explain things.  20 And it seems that intelligent design people violate  21 those norms, and that's perhaps why they are rightly  22 disciplined, for not conforming to this community's</p>
<p>110</p> <p>1 that truth is worth seeking. That, again, is not part  2 of science, but it is foundational to science. There  3 has to be, also, a belief that the human mind is of  4 sufficient stature to grasp the truth when it comes  5 across it.  6 These are tacit elements that are present in  7 the actual work of science, underlying the work of  8 science, of which perhaps many scientists themselves  9 are even unaware that they're necessary for the whole  10 process of science to get off the ground.  11 Q Any other factors?  12 A For natural science, of course, there has to  13 be the data of the natural world itself, but those are  14 the main ones that I would emphasize.  15 Q Okay. Is there any concept that you're  16 aware of that requires a majority vote by scientists  17 of what is a scientific theory and what is not?  18 A I don't think it's -- it has to be a formal  19 vote, but over the years a certain conventional  20 approach develops in such a way that those who become  21 apprenticed to what's called scientific method have to  22 learn. They have to learn -- it's a skill. It's a</p>	<p>112</p> <p>1 skills.  2 Q When you say "disciplined," what do you mean  3 by that?  4 A Yeah. Well, you have to purify your mind of  5 tendencies to explain things, for example, in terms of  6 purpose. It's hard to do that, but that's what's  7 required. That's what -- since the beginning of  8 the -- since the middle of the 17th century --  9 Q I misunderstood, then. I thought they were  10 disciplined in some way by the science community  11 itself?  12 A By "discipline" I mean a set of standards  13 that don't necessarily come spontaneously to us. I  14 mean, our common sense way of looking at the world is  15 always looking at it for purposes, but science says,  16 let's -- let's -- it's kind of like a game of soccer,  17 you know. You decide when you play soccer, I'm not  18 going to use my hands and I'm going to see what I can  19 accomplish athletically by just using my feet. So  20 science says, now, let's see what we can accomplish  21 here cognitively by leaving out discussions of  22 purpose, God, intelligence, see what we can find by</p>



DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

29 (Pages 113 to 116)

<p>113</p> <p>1 looking at the natural world in this way.</p> <p>2 Q But tomorrow the science community or over a</p> <p>3 period of time can change those rules; is that</p> <p>4 correct?</p> <p>5 A That would be completely different. If that</p> <p>6 happens, it would not be science anymore. It would be</p> <p>7 something else.</p> <p>8 Q Well, if they say it's science, it's going</p> <p>9 to be science; right?</p> <p>10 A Well, I'm using the term science as I just</p> <p>11 described it a while ago, and as I've been describing</p> <p>12 it all morning, as having to conform to what's</p> <p>13 empirically available.</p> <p>14 Q Right. But these are rules that are</p> <p>15 man-made; correct?</p> <p>16 A To say that they're man-made does not</p> <p>17 adequately represent these rules. These rules are —</p> <p>18 are things that come about as a result of a complicity</p> <p>19 of the human mind and the structures of the natural</p> <p>20 world. So it's not just arbitrary. It's not just a</p> <p>21 wild guess. To say it's just a theory, for example,</p> <p>22 is to miss the whole point of a scientific theory.</p>	<p>115</p> <p>1 Q Could it not?</p> <p>2 MR. WILCOX: You could call it</p> <p>3 football.</p> <p>4 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>5 Q Could you not?</p> <p>6 A You can change the rules, but since rules</p> <p>7 specify the identity of a particular game or a</p> <p>8 particular kind of intellectual inquiry, then if you</p> <p>9 change the rules of science, for example, to include</p> <p>10 appeal to the hypothesis of intelligent design, then</p> <p>11 you've changed the whole definition of science into</p> <p>12 something that most scientists since the beginning —</p> <p>13 since the middle of the 17th century would not</p> <p>14 recognize as science.</p> <p>15 Q Okay. But up to the 17th century scientists</p> <p>16 thought it was science?</p> <p>17 A In the Middle Ages the word scientia was</p> <p>18 used by people like Thomas Aquinas to refer to the</p> <p>19 gathering in of understanding about the world in many,</p> <p>20 many different ways, including theological and</p> <p>21 philosophical. But the way the word science has been</p> <p>22 defined in modern scientific — so-called scientific</p>
<p>114</p> <p>1 Q Well, it's a — well, it is scientific and</p> <p>2 it is not testable by scientific methods, though?</p> <p>3 MR. WILCOX: What's the antecedent of</p> <p>4 "it"?</p> <p>5 THE WITNESS: When you say "it," you</p> <p>6 mean scientific method is not provable by scientific</p> <p>7 method?</p> <p>8 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>9 Q Right.</p> <p>10 A Right. No, it's not.</p> <p>11 Q Again, you used the soccer analogy. If</p> <p>12 tomorrow you wanted to change the rules of soccer, you</p> <p>13 can change the rules of soccer; isn't that correct?</p> <p>14 A Sure.</p> <p>15 Q And you can do the same thing with the rules</p> <p>16 of science; isn't that correct?</p> <p>17 A It would not be called soccer anymore. It</p> <p>18 would be called some other sport.</p> <p>19 Q Well, it still could be called soccer.</p> <p>20 You've just changed the rules.</p> <p>21 MR. WILCOX: You could —</p> <p>22 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p>	<p>116</p> <p>1 disciplines is such as to leave out things that before</p> <p>2 the 17th century were considered to be science. For</p> <p>3 example, aristotelianism was rampant at the time of</p> <p>4 Galileo, and Aristotle was interested in learning</p> <p>5 about the purpose of things.</p> <p>6 Galileo and Bacon before him had said, okay,</p> <p>7 it's all right to talk about the purpose of things,</p> <p>8 but we're going to get this new approach to</p> <p>9 understanding the world in which we leave out</p> <p>10 questions about purpose. For example, Aristotle</p> <p>11 understood gravity as the desire on the part of the</p> <p>12 center of the earth for objects. Desire. Desire</p> <p>13 cannot be quantified mathematically, so one of the</p> <p>14 important things that modern science did was to</p> <p>15 explain gravity, for example, in terms of a</p> <p>16 mathematical formula, and that mathematical formula is</p> <p>17 essential to the discipline of natural science.</p> <p>18 Q One of the criteria of science, though, is</p> <p>19 that it is always tentative; is that correct?</p> <p>20 A Yeah, that should be the criterion of</p> <p>21 religion, theology and all human knowledge.</p> <p>22 Q So that conceivably ten years from now the</p>



DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

30 (Pages 117 to 120)

<p style="text-align: right;">117</p> <p>1 idea of science could be totally different; is that a</p> <p>2 possibility?</p> <p>3 A It's possible that people can develop</p> <p>4 methods of understanding things. For example, in the</p> <p>5 20th century development an empirical method was</p> <p>6 developed in philosophy known as phenomenology, and,</p> <p>7 so, there can be -- there's plenty of room for the</p> <p>8 development of different kinds of method. For</p> <p>9 example, I, myself, in the book that I'm writing now</p> <p>10 and in other contexts, have referred to a wider</p> <p>11 empiricism that goes beyond what science deals with.</p> <p>12 For example, we all know that we are</p> <p>13 subjects. Each one of us has an insideness that we</p> <p>14 experience palpably and immediately. That's part of</p> <p>15 the natural world, too. But science has deliberately</p> <p>16 decided that we're not going to talk about</p> <p>17 subjectivity.</p> <p>18 Well, they're not going to talk about</p> <p>19 subjectivity, so let's -- what I'm proposing is that</p> <p>20 there be a wider or more radical kind of empiricism</p> <p>21 that takes into account data that science</p> <p>22 methodologically leaves out. But I don't call it</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">119</p> <p>1 Q Right. But that empiricism will affect the</p> <p>2 way or could affect the way scientists view science;</p> <p>3 isn't it true?</p> <p>4 A I don't know. I -- if it does -- if it does</p> <p>5 lead to something else, I'm not sure that I would call</p> <p>6 it science, and I'm almost certain that most of the</p> <p>7 present scientific community would not call it science</p> <p>8 either.</p> <p>9 Q Well, see, at one point, you know, when</p> <p>10 Darwin came up with his theory, the attack on him was</p> <p>11 that it was not science; isn't that true?</p> <p>12 A Well, some would say that and some still say</p> <p>13 it.</p> <p>14 Q Well, I mean, but at the time his</p> <p>15 contemporaries attacked him as not being science;</p> <p>16 isn't that true?</p> <p>17 A Some of them did. In fact, his fellow</p> <p>18 scientists were more critical even than the clergy</p> <p>19 were toward him.</p> <p>20 Q Right. But I -- but that proves --</p> <p>21 A Some of his fellow scientists, not all of</p> <p>22 them.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">118</p> <p>1 science.</p> <p>2 Q Well, I was --</p> <p>3 A I call it wider empiricism.</p> <p>4 Q Well, it could --</p> <p>5 A Out of my respect --</p> <p>6 Q Excuse me. Go ahead.</p> <p>7 A Out of my respect for the community and</p> <p>8 tradition of involving several centuries of refining a</p> <p>9 particular method and referring to it as science, I</p> <p>10 want to let science be science, but that doesn't mean</p> <p>11 that science is -- is the only way of empirically</p> <p>12 coming into contact with the natural world.</p> <p>13 Q Let me suggest to you that what you said,</p> <p>14 however, may be the beginning of a new understanding</p> <p>15 of science; isn't that possible?</p> <p>16 A Well, I'm not the vetter of this. I'm</p> <p>17 following several major philosophers; Teilhard de</p> <p>18 Chardin, Bernard Lonergan, Henri Bergson, Alfred North</p> <p>19 Whitehead, all of who are -- William James, all of</p> <p>20 whom have developed a wide empiricism --</p> <p>21 Q But that empiricism --</p> <p>22 A -- but they don't call it science.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">120</p> <p>1 Q But, see, attack -- but history has a way of</p> <p>2 repeating itself, and it seems that the attack on</p> <p>3 Darwin as not being science -- Darwin's Theory of</p> <p>4 Evolution as not being science could be compared to</p> <p>5 the attack on the intelligent design theorists today</p> <p>6 who are attacked as not being scientists.</p> <p>7 MR. WILCOX: Objection, argumentative.</p> <p>8 THE WITNESS: I don't think that's a</p> <p>9 valid comparison, because as I've been saying all</p> <p>10 morning, intelligent design people are bringing in</p> <p>11 kind of explanatory or resorting to a kind of</p> <p>12 explanatory level or reading level that is</p> <p>13 inappropriate to what we refer to as natural</p> <p>14 scientific method. It might be a valid -- it might be</p> <p>15 a valid approach to appeal to the notion of</p> <p>16 intelligence at some level in your understanding of</p> <p>17 phenomena, but that doesn't mean that science itself</p> <p>18 is going to resort to such a notion because to do so</p> <p>19 while you're doing science is to close off the road to</p> <p>20 further naturalistic inquiry.</p> <p>21 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>22 Q You would agree that on occasion theories</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

31 (Pages 121 to 124)

<p style="text-align: right;">121</p> <p>1 which were ridiculed by the contemporary scientists --</p> <p>2 A Yes.</p> <p>3 Q -- have then developed to be the workable or</p> <p>4 the explanatory theory later on?</p> <p>5 A Yes.</p> <p>6 Q Okay.</p> <p>7 A Yes.</p> <p>8 Q And, so, that just because a particular</p> <p>9 theory is held by a few or a minority of scientists</p> <p>10 does not in any way affect the validity of the theory</p> <p>11 itself --</p> <p>12 A That's correct.</p> <p>13 Q -- is that true?</p> <p>14 A That's correct. The relativity theory would</p> <p>15 be a good example.</p> <p>16 Q And because of that, do you have any concern</p> <p>17 that the community of scientists themselves who have</p> <p>18 vested a lot of their career on the theory of</p> <p>19 intelligent design may be attacking -- a career on</p> <p>20 evolution, excuse me, may be attacking the theory of</p> <p>21 intelligent design for other than pure scientific</p> <p>22 motives?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">123</p> <p>1 theory, motivation should be bracketed. When you're</p> <p>2 talking about theological theories, that's something</p> <p>3 else.</p> <p>4 Q Well, putting it another way, the validity</p> <p>5 of a scientific theory --</p> <p>6 A Right.</p> <p>7 Q -- should not be determined by the</p> <p>8 motivation of a scientist who is proposing that</p> <p>9 theory, is that correct?</p> <p>10 A In the field of science, I would say that</p> <p>11 that's correct.</p> <p>12 Q And, so, some of the anti-intelligent design</p> <p>13 advocates out there attack the theory of intelligent</p> <p>14 design based upon the motivation of its proponents</p> <p>15 rather than the theory itself; do you agree with that?</p> <p>16 A I suspect that that's true at times, yes.</p> <p>17 Q Well, isn't Barbara Forrest one of them?</p> <p>18 A I don't know. I can't say.</p> <p>19 Q Okay. But in the scientific world or in the</p> <p>20 academic world, you would want to look at the validity</p> <p>21 or the invalidity of the theory and not so much as to</p> <p>22 the person who was advancing the theory.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">122</p> <p>1 A A particular scientist as a person can, and,</p> <p>2 I think, inevitably this has occurred, has attacked</p> <p>3 intelligent design because of kind of a temperamental</p> <p>4 opposition to anything that smacks of religion.</p> <p>5 Richard Dawkins is a good example. He's</p> <p>6 constantly attacking certain ideas, not for scientific</p> <p>7 reasons, but because they don't fit into his world</p> <p>8 view. We're all capable of doing that. But that is,</p> <p>9 in a sense, to commit the genetic fallacy; that is, to</p> <p>10 understand things in terms of how they originate</p> <p>11 rather than in terms of their ostensible, logical</p> <p>12 veracity. And, so, the theory of evolution has to be</p> <p>13 weighted in terms of its intrinsic cognitional</p> <p>14 explanatory power rather than in terms of why it might</p> <p>15 appeal to this person or that. And the same thing</p> <p>16 would be true of many scientific ideas. We have to</p> <p>17 distinguish.</p> <p>18 Q And does that also lead to a fair statement</p> <p>19 that you should not look at the motivation of the</p> <p>20 scientist but actually the scientific theory that he</p> <p>21 is or she is espousing?</p> <p>22 A Yes, when you're talking about a scientific</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">124</p> <p>1 A That's -- I would say that's the -- that's</p> <p>2 true in the case of science but not necessarily in the</p> <p>3 case of philosophy and theology.</p> <p>4 Q Why do you make that distinction, science</p> <p>5 versus philosophy and theology?</p> <p>6 A Because when you're talking about a world</p> <p>7 view as distinct from a scientific fact, you're</p> <p>8 talking about something in which the personal</p> <p>9 coefficient of that particular world view is</p> <p>10 inseparable from the world view itself.</p> <p>11 Q But I assume even yourself as a theologian</p> <p>12 attempt to eliminate whatever personal bias or</p> <p>13 prejudices you may have as you attempt to solve</p> <p>14 whatever problem you're looking at.</p> <p>15 A What you try to eliminate is any theory or</p> <p>16 any set of ideas which flows from any other desire</p> <p>17 than the desire to know the truth.</p> <p>18 We all have desires; desire for pleasure,</p> <p>19 desire for meaning, desire for power and so forth. We</p> <p>20 need to be suspicious of any idea that flows from</p> <p>21 those particular desires. But the desire to know is a</p> <p>22 deeply personal desire, desire to know the truth, and</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

32 (Pages 125 to 128)

<p style="text-align: right;">125</p> <p>1 I can't disassociate my -- my own theological view of</p> <p>2 the world from -- from what is deeply personal to me.</p> <p>3 Whereas in science, you want to -- as far as possible</p> <p>4 you want to keep subjectivity and personality out of</p> <p>5 the method, which is one of the reasons why</p> <p>6 intelligent design is so problematic, because it's --</p> <p>7 when you're talking about intelligent design, you're</p> <p>8 talking about something that is much more deeply</p> <p>9 personal than, say, the theory of natural selection.</p> <p>10 Q Deeply -- well, other than people like</p> <p>11 Richard Dawkins, would you agree, who --</p> <p>12 A Right.</p> <p>13 Q -- who has a --</p> <p>14 A Well, when Dawkins is doing biology, I have</p> <p>15 no problem. When he gets into his polemic against</p> <p>16 religion, then his personality, his own temperament,</p> <p>17 his own biography, his own personal bad experiences</p> <p>18 with religion and so forth, all that all comes to the</p> <p>19 surface; whereas when he's doing science, he leaves</p> <p>20 that behind or at least he should leave it behind.</p> <p>21 Q There are very few -- strike that.</p> <p>22 Is there -- can -- can the truth of theology</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">127</p> <p>1 Q Okay. Ah, I found the statement I was</p> <p>2 looking for, and I want to ask you what you mean by</p> <p>3 this. Okay. It's not a verbatim; it's a paraphrase,</p> <p>4 but -- this is in your book Deeper Than Darwin: The</p> <p>5 evolutionary explanation employs a metaphoric and</p> <p>6 narrative mode of expression not found in physics or</p> <p>7 biochemistry. The inevitable fuzziness of their</p> <p>8 narrative, historical accounts of life can be a source</p> <p>9 of embarrassment. At times they apologize for telling</p> <p>10 evolutionary stories promising us that as their</p> <p>11 science progresses it will be able to dispense with</p> <p>12 narrative and embed the information in mathematics.</p> <p>13 A That's the --</p> <p>14 Q Do you remember that statement?</p> <p>15 A Yes, that's the ideal of the evolutionary</p> <p>16 biologist, but there is a narrative character to it</p> <p>17 that you don't find in every science.</p> <p>18 Q And I think that was the statement that I</p> <p>19 was -- had in mind when I asked you about</p> <p>20 evolutionists filling in the gaps with these stories</p> <p>21 and these narratives promising later on they're going</p> <p>22 to find the facts.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">126</p> <p>1 contradict the truth of science?</p> <p>2 A No, no, just as the water is boiling because</p> <p>3 I want tea does not contradict the water is boiling</p> <p>4 because of molecular motion.</p> <p>5 Q According to Gould, the philosophical</p> <p>6 message of Darwinism cannot be disengaged from</p> <p>7 Darwin's science. Do you agree with that statement?</p> <p>8 A I think I wrote that statement.</p> <p>9 Q Yeah.</p> <p>10 A Yes. I do agree with it, yes.</p> <p>11 Q Okay. And, so, even though you want to --</p> <p>12 A That's what Gould says. That's not what I</p> <p>13 believe.</p> <p>14 Q Right. Yeah. But even though you believe</p> <p>15 that the science should be separated from the</p> <p>16 philosophy --</p> <p>17 A Correct.</p> <p>18 Q -- many Darwinists don't do that --</p> <p>19 A Exactly.</p> <p>20 Q -- because they believe it shouldn't be;</p> <p>21 isn't that correct?</p> <p>22 A Some of them do, correct.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">128</p> <p>1 A Well, that they're going to be more precise,</p> <p>2 yes.</p> <p>3 Q Okay.</p> <p>4 A Narrativeness is one way of conceptualizing</p> <p>5 or bringing into coherence a set of data.</p> <p>6 Q I looked at that statement and I viewed it</p> <p>7 as somewhat very critical of these kinds of</p> <p>8 evolutionists. Am I wrong in taking it that way?</p> <p>9 A No, I'm not critical of that at all. That's</p> <p>10 the way evolutionary explanations have always worked,</p> <p>11 by placing -- by storing it -- by putting it in the</p> <p>12 narrative context, because evolution, unlike other</p> <p>13 scientists -- unlike other sciences, is much more</p> <p>14 concerned with long periods of time in which</p> <p>15 transformations take place, many others -- some other</p> <p>16 sciences, like cosmology is, too, but evolution</p> <p>17 requires deep, deep time, and whenever you're talking</p> <p>18 about the transition from one stage to another in a</p> <p>19 temporal process, the mode of discourse that you would</p> <p>20 resort to has to be somewhat narrative in nature.</p> <p>21 Q You use the words "can be a source of</p> <p>22 embarrassment." I look at that as sort of a negative</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005.

33 (Pages 129 to 132)

<p>129</p> <p>1 connotation.</p> <p>2 A Well, there are certain kinds of scientific</p> <p>3 perists, perhaps, who would find that narrative is --</p> <p>4 is not enough and that we need to embed the data in</p> <p>5 mathematical formula. And, indeed, biologists are</p> <p>6 doing that today, especially in terms of the</p> <p>7 transition of populations of genes from one generation</p> <p>8 to the next which can be statistically quantified in</p> <p>9 certain ways.</p> <p>10 Q And the other -- and the other phraseology</p> <p>11 that again leads me to believe that this was a</p> <p>12 criticism of evolutionary explanation was the</p> <p>13 "inevitable fuzziness of their narrative."</p> <p>14 A Well, if you place that in the context of</p> <p>15 Deeper Than Darwin, fuzziness is not necessarily</p> <p>16 unexplanatory. Fuzziness is the way of admitting at</p> <p>17 the moment that we need to sharpen our way of thinking</p> <p>18 but that we can make at least approximate statements</p> <p>19 about the nature of things, and this approximation --</p> <p>20 approximation is always part of every science. No</p> <p>21 science is completely without fuzziness.</p> <p>22 Q Okay. Would you consider that a weakness in</p>	<p>131</p> <p>1 Q That's what kind of ignorance?</p> <p>2 A Learned ignorance, as it's called.</p> <p>3 Q Learned. So you would characterize</p> <p>4 evolutionary theory as learned ignorance?</p> <p>5 A I would say that every good science -- every</p> <p>6 good scientist has to have a sense of learned</p> <p>7 ignorance, and it's actually the skill in science</p> <p>8 itself that shows a particular person who's doing</p> <p>9 science that there is so much yet that remains to be</p> <p>10 discovered and known, and Darwin -- Darwinism is no</p> <p>11 exception to but an exemplification of a general</p> <p>12 scientific principle that we should approach nature</p> <p>13 with learned ignorance.</p> <p>14 MR. WILCOX: I think the Secretary of</p> <p>15 Defense could explain this to you pretty well. There</p> <p>16 are things that we know we don't know.</p> <p>17 MR. THOMPSON: Right. You want to take</p> <p>18 a lunch break?</p> <p>19 MR. WILCOX: Sure.</p> <p>20 (Lunch recess -- 12:03 p.m.)</p> <p>21 (After lunch recess -- 12:58 p.m.)</p> <p>22 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p>
<p>130</p> <p>1 Darwin's theory?</p> <p>2 A No, just the opposite. I would say it shows</p> <p>3 that Darwinian theory has a future, and which if it's</p> <p>4 not interfered with by such interpositions as</p> <p>5 intelligent design, will allow further refinement,</p> <p>6 further specification of what's going on in the</p> <p>7 future.</p> <p>8 Q Would you consider it a gap that still has</p> <p>9 to be filled?</p> <p>10 A Again, I would not use the term gap. I</p> <p>11 would say it's the unknown knowable or the knowable</p> <p>12 unknown.</p> <p>13 MR. WILCOX: That we just don't know</p> <p>14 yet.</p> <p>15 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>16 Q You mean gap?</p> <p>17 A Well, I'm using -- I'm using the expression</p> <p>18 that goes back to the philosophical discourse where</p> <p>19 people distinguish between learned ignorance and</p> <p>20 unlearned ignorance. Learned ignorance, the Socratic</p> <p>21 term, is ignorance that's aware of how much yet there</p> <p>22 is to be known.</p>	<p>132</p> <p>1 Q Professor Haught, earlier you had indicated</p> <p>2 there is a difference between the theory of</p> <p>3 intelligent design and creationism; is that correct?</p> <p>4 A I think so, yes.</p> <p>5 Q And what is that difference?</p> <p>6 A Well, as I understand it, almost everybody</p> <p>7 without exception that I've read who calls himself or</p> <p>8 herself a creationist today in the sense that word is</p> <p>9 used in the evolution discussion is someone who would</p> <p>10 interpret the creation stories in the Bible quite</p> <p>11 literally; whereas not every advocate of intelligent</p> <p>12 design is a biblical literalist. That's the main</p> <p>13 distinction that I would point out.</p> <p>14 Q So would you give me, please, a definition</p> <p>15 of creationism in your view, then?</p> <p>16 A Well, creationism, as I see it, is an</p> <p>17 interpretation of nature which takes the biblical</p> <p>18 sequence of biblical narrative of creation and the</p> <p>19 sequence of days involved in the creation story as</p> <p>20 corresponding literally and factually to the way in</p> <p>21 which the biological record was implemented.</p> <p>22 Q In that case is it true that creationists</p>



DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

34 (Pages 133 to 136)

<p>133</p> <p>1 believe that the earth is about 10,000 years old?</p> <p>2 A There are young earth creationists and old</p> <p>3 earth creationists. The young ones believe 6 to</p> <p>4 10,000 years as the age of the earth.</p> <p>5 Q What do the old earth creationists believe?</p> <p>6 A The old earth creationists as far as I know</p> <p>7 are willing at times to go along with the modern</p> <p>8 geological estimation of the earth as four and a half</p> <p>9 billion years old. What they have in common is the</p> <p>10 special creation of each species by divine</p> <p>11 intervention. The old earth creationists would allow</p> <p>12 for the special creation as taking place sequentially</p> <p>13 across time whereas the young earth creationists see</p> <p>14 the special creation of all species as taking place in</p> <p>15 the beginning.</p> <p>16 I recognize that there are many different</p> <p>17 stripes within the creationist camp.</p> <p>18 Q Would another criteria for a creationist be</p> <p>19 the fact that they believe the earth was created in</p> <p>20 six days -- six, 24-hour days?</p> <p>21 A Some of them would probably believe that,</p> <p>22 but, again, I think there are probably many different</p>	<p>135</p> <p>1 theorists, they do not build their theory upon holy</p> <p>2 scripture; is that correct?</p> <p>3 A The creationists do build their theory upon</p> <p>4 scripture.</p> <p>5 Q The intelligent design theorists do not?</p> <p>6 A The intelligent design theorists, at least</p> <p>7 some of them -- there are many different types of</p> <p>8 intelligent design theorists, including creationists,</p> <p>9 but there are advocates of intelligent design who do</p> <p>10 not start with scriptural text as the framework for</p> <p>11 their ideas.</p> <p>12 Q In fact, there are atheists who are</p> <p>13 advocates or who believe in intelligent design?</p> <p>14 A I don't know of any. David Berlinski might</p> <p>15 be somebody who is taken in by the intelligent design</p> <p>16 people, but I don't think that he has ever</p> <p>17 affirmatively declared intelligent design --</p> <p>18 intelligent design as the foundation of life.</p> <p>19 Q What about the philosopher Anthony Flew;</p> <p>20 wasn't he an atheist?</p> <p>21 A Yes, he was an atheist.</p> <p>22 Q And then he --</p>
<p>134</p> <p>1 varieties of creationists.</p> <p>2 Q Is it a criteria of creationists that they</p> <p>3 refer to the Book of Genesis as the basis of their</p> <p>4 scientific theories?</p> <p>5 A I know of no exceptions to that.</p> <p>6 Q So --</p> <p>7 A Yes.</p> <p>8 Q -- yes?</p> <p>9 As I understand it, creationists then start</p> <p>10 with the Book of Genesis and then build their</p> <p>11 scientific theory upon that sacred scripture?</p> <p>12 MR. WILCOX: Objection.</p> <p>13 THE WITNESS: There are creationists</p> <p>14 and there are creation scientists or scientific</p> <p>15 creationists. The latter use the Book of Genesis as</p> <p>16 the criterion by which to judge the validity of any</p> <p>17 science, so they interpret by superimposing upon the</p> <p>18 biblical text scientific expectations. They interpret</p> <p>19 the biblical text, especially Genesis, as</p> <p>20 scientifically accurate.</p> <p>21 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>22 Q And in contrast with intelligent design,</p>	<p>136</p> <p>1 A He has recently wondered how biological</p> <p>2 phenomena could be explained without the complicity of</p> <p>3 a creator.</p> <p>4 Q And he has publicly at least accepted</p> <p>5 intelligent design theory, has he not?</p> <p>6 A I don't think so. I think he has been more</p> <p>7 cautious than that. I think it's more that the</p> <p>8 intelligent design people have taken him in than he</p> <p>9 has taken in the intelligent design community.</p> <p>10 Q Well, to what degree, then, do you think he</p> <p>11 has accepted intelligent design theory then?</p> <p>12 A I don't know that he's even that familiar</p> <p>13 with so-called intelligent design theory. He has</p> <p>14 spoken just very vaguely about how the complexity in</p> <p>15 living phenomena seem to him to require some</p> <p>16 explanation that science, including Darwinian science,</p> <p>17 has not been able to give.</p> <p>18 Q Has he said that that complexity points him</p> <p>19 to an intelligent design?</p> <p>20 A I think the most he would say is that -- as</p> <p>21 far as I understand the news media and reports about</p> <p>22 it, I think the most that he has said is that it</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

35 (Pages 137 to 140)

<p style="text-align: right;">137</p> <p>1 suggests that something more than just chance and          2 blind, natural processes would have had to bring about          3 the complex living phenomena.          4 Q And that kind of conclusion is contrary to          5 Darwinian theory, is it not?          6 A No, I personally do not think so. I think          7 what he's doing is drawing a philosophical conclusion,          8 and, in fact, he's very close to Darwin in the fact          9 that he appeals to a deistic god, that is, a god who          10 is very remote and who explains the general laws and          11 is somewhat — something that we have to appeal to to          12 give an ultimate explanation, but it's not the God of          13 Christianity, it's not the God of the Bible that          14 Anthony Flew is referring to here. It's something          15 very close to what Darwin meant when he referred to          16 the creator.          17 Darwin himself probably never completely          18 gave up a deistic notion of God, that is, a god who          19 creates the universe, creates its fundamental laws but          20 pretty much lets it run on its own. That's the same          21 kind of god that Anthony Flew is talking about, so          22 it's much closer to Darwin's understanding.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">139</p> <p>1 Q Yes.          2 A — who was interested more in contemplating          3 his own glorious, divine essence than actually being          4 involved in the world.          5 Q Well, isn't that somewhat of the concept          6 that you have of God, that you've explained in your          7 book Deeper Than Darwin?          8 A No, absolutely not. The God that I believe          9 in is deeply involved and is cosufferer with life and          10 its struggle throughout the evolutionary process.          11 Q Does he intervene in the world?          12 A To use the word intervention is a very, very          13 vague term. To say that there is divine action and          14 divine influence in the world, I believe so. But to          15 say that this is of the same kind of causality that          16 science deals with or that intelligent design appeals          17 to, no, that's not what I mean.          18 Q Well, does your definition of God mean that          19 God is outside of nature?          20 A I don't say — use the word "outside." I          21 would say distinct from nature but intimately involved          22 with nature. God transcends the world and God is not</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">138</p> <p>1 Q Would that still be a religious concept?          2 A Yes, I think it's a religious concept, sure,          3 uh-huh, yes. And that's why it does not belong in          4 science.          5 Q Well, maybe I'm interpreting what you said,          6 but basically a deistic concept would mean maybe there          7 was a god that started it all —          8 A Right.          9 Q — sort of a first cause and then let it          10 happen?          11 A Yes.          12 Q Isn't that somewhat of the same kind of          13 first cause that Aristotle talked about?          14 MR. WILCOX: Objection, vague, "isn't          15 that somewhat of the same kind." Are there any          16 similarities?          17 THE WITNESS: Well, there are vague          18 similarities.          19 BY MR. THOMPSON:          20 Q Okay. Didn't Aristotle talk about the first          21 cause?          22 A The first cause and the unmoved mover —</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">140</p> <p>1 identical with nature, but the God of the Bible, the          2 God that I believe in as a Christian and as a Catholic          3 is deeply involved in nature, and we know this God not          4 as above nature but in and through nature.          5 Q Does God change the laws of nature?          6 A When you talk about nature, nature can          7 include many universes other than this one. That's          8 the natural world, too. That's become a reasonable          9 hypothesis in contemporary quantum theories of          10 creation.          11 The laws that pertain to those worlds would          12 probably be different from the laws that pertain to          13 ours, so — and over the course of many, many millions          14 and billions of years, nature itself could possibly          15 alter its habits. We don't know. As scientists we          16 deal with such a small cross-section of cosmic          17 history, but we do believe as scientists that the          18 universe — the present universe adheres to laws or          19 habits, I like to call them, that have been inherent          20 in nature from the beginning.          21 Q I want to direct your attention to the          22 concept of a scientific theory. What would be your</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

36 (Pages 141 to 144)

<p style="text-align: right;">141</p> <p>1 definition of a scientific theory?</p> <p>2 A Scientific theory is a set of concepts that</p> <p>3 organizes the data of scientific discovery into an</p> <p>4 intelligible, conceptual framework that can be tested</p> <p>5 empirically.</p> <p>6 Q Would you agree with the statement, and I'm</p> <p>7 quoting from the policy, a theory is defined as a</p> <p>8 well-tested explanation that unifies a broad range of</p> <p>9 observations, end of quote?</p> <p>10 A Yes, in general I think I can accept that.</p> <p>11 Q Okay.</p> <p>12 A But I would only add that it unifies them in</p> <p>13 such a way as to allow them to be continually tested</p> <p>14 against empirical data and new data that keeps coming</p> <p>15 in.</p> <p>16 Q Then you would accept the next statement I'm</p> <p>17 going to read: Because Darwin's theory is a theory,</p> <p>18 it continues to be tested as new evidence is</p> <p>19 discovered. Do you agree with that statement?</p> <p>20 A Yes.</p> <p>21 Q Okay. "A theory is not a fact." What about</p> <p>22 that statement?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">143</p> <p>1 it's a duplication of other things that I've read by</p> <p>2 him in the past. (Witness reviews document.) No, I</p> <p>3 did not read this particular one. If this is a new</p> <p>4 piece, I didn't read it.</p> <p>5 Q In his report he indicates that a theory is</p> <p>6 a singular word applied to a body of multiple,</p> <p>7 distinct claims -- that's the headline. And then he</p> <p>8 says, It is critical to realize that in science the</p> <p>9 word theory in the singular may be applied to a body</p> <p>10 of multiple, logically separable claims, some of which</p> <p>11 may turn out to be true and others false.</p> <p>12 Do you agree or disagree with that</p> <p>13 statement?</p> <p>14 A Yeah. The only thing I would -- yes, the</p> <p>15 only thing I would add is that he's left out the word</p> <p>16 empirical and talked about logical. Science is more</p> <p>17 than logic. It's also observation.</p> <p>18 Q Okay. So adding the word observation -- the</p> <p>19 concept of observation, I guess, you would agree with</p> <p>20 his theory; is that correct?</p> <p>21 A Read that again.</p> <p>22 Q Okay. It is critical to realize that in</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">142</p> <p>1 A A theory is a set of insights. A fact --</p> <p>2 let me define a fact. A fact is a product not of</p> <p>3 seeing but of judging. The way the mind works is to</p> <p>4 start with empirically evident data. Secondly, the</p> <p>5 way the mind works, including the scientific mind, is</p> <p>6 to form hypotheses and theories to try to make sense</p> <p>7 of that data so that we can get insight into that</p> <p>8 data.</p> <p>9 But that's not enough for science. Science</p> <p>10 has to go and keep testing the theory against the</p> <p>11 data, and if it finds that the theory corresponds</p> <p>12 adequately to the data, then science makes the</p> <p>13 judgment that the theory corresponds to the data and</p> <p>14 that's a fact. That's where fact comes in as a</p> <p>15 product of judgment, not of understanding.</p> <p>16 Q Right. And did you read Behe's report --</p> <p>17 expert witness report dealing --</p> <p>18 A Not.</p> <p>19 Q -- with --</p> <p>20 A -- this --</p> <p>21 Q -- theory?</p> <p>22 A Not this -- not this particular one unless</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">144</p> <p>1 science the word theory in the singular may be applied</p> <p>2 to a body of multiple, logically separable claims,</p> <p>3 some of which may turn out to be true and others</p> <p>4 false -- and then I'll continue -- which can vary</p> <p>5 widely in the strength of the evidence supporting them</p> <p>6 and the ease with which they can be tested.</p> <p>7 A I'm not comfortable with that. I'm not</p> <p>8 comfortable with that, especially with the idea that</p> <p>9 the elements of a theory are logically -- potentially</p> <p>10 logically inconsistent.</p> <p>11 Q You would agree that Darwin's theory has</p> <p>12 changed over time; is that correct?</p> <p>13 A No, I would agree --</p> <p>14 Q The concept of Darwin's theory has changed</p> <p>15 over time?</p> <p>16 A Darwin's theory has not changed. Theories</p> <p>17 of biological evolution have evolved. What we refer</p> <p>18 to today as Darwinian evolution is not exactly the</p> <p>19 same as Darwin's Theory of Evolution; although, it's</p> <p>20 in many ways -- in many ways it is similar but other</p> <p>21 things have been added.</p> <p>22 Q Right. He had no concept of genetics at</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, P.I.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

37 (Pages 145 to 148)

<p style="text-align: right;">145</p> <p>1 that time?</p> <p>2 A He had no concept of how inheritance takes</p> <p>3 place.</p> <p>4 Q Correct.</p> <p>5 A He had his ideas about it, but the ideas</p> <p>6 have turned out to be wrong.</p> <p>7 Q So at one point, going back to Darwin's</p> <p>8 time, although he had this theory, part of it proved</p> <p>9 to be wrong?</p> <p>10 A The part that has -- the theory has an</p> <p>11 element of how descent inheritance takes place, and it</p> <p>12 has an element of what the mechanisms of change over</p> <p>13 time are. The mechanisms of change over time have not</p> <p>14 been altered. They've been enhanced, actually, by new</p> <p>15 discoveries. But the actual -- his ideas on how</p> <p>16 descent takes place and his notion of inheritance has</p> <p>17 evolved.</p> <p>18 Q You have eluded to various aspects of what</p> <p>19 we call Darwin's Theory of Evolution, and according to</p> <p>20 Meyer's report, he cites that Ernst Mayr --</p> <p>21 MR. WILCOX: I'm sorry. You're</p> <p>22 referring to whose report?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">147</p> <p>1 A Yeah.</p> <p>2 Q The second separate claim of so-called</p> <p>3 Darwin's theory is common descent. This is the theory</p> <p>4 that every group of organisms descended from a common</p> <p>5 ancestor and that all groups of organisms, including</p> <p>6 animals, plants and microorganisms, ultimately go back</p> <p>7 to a single origin of life on earth.</p> <p>8 Do you accept that as another claim?</p> <p>9 A I accept that. Although I'm not absolutely</p> <p>10 certain about that, I can accept that.</p> <p>11 Q Okay. This is what Ernst Mayr was saying --</p> <p>12 A Right, right, right.</p> <p>13 Q -- as to what the five different claims are</p> <p>14 under Darwin's theory.</p> <p>15 And then the third one is, Multiplication of</p> <p>16 species: This theory explains the origin of the</p> <p>17 enormous organic diversity. It postulates that</p> <p>18 species multiply either by splitting into daughter</p> <p>19 species or by budding, that is, by the establishment</p> <p>20 of geographically isolated founder populations that</p> <p>21 evolve into new species; is that --</p> <p>22 A I agree with that with the proviso that</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">146</p> <p>1 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>2 Q Behe's report, expert report. But he cites</p> <p>3 Ernst Mayr --</p> <p>4 A It's Mayr.</p> <p>5 Q -- M-A-Y-R -- Mayr?</p> <p>6 A Ernst Mayr.</p> <p>7 Q Okay. He claims -- who was an evolutionist</p> <p>8 who claimed that what is commonly called Darwin's</p> <p>9 theory actually contains at least five distinct</p> <p>10 claims. Are you familiar with his --</p> <p>11 A I've read that, but I can't -- I can't list</p> <p>12 the five elements at this moment.</p> <p>13 Q Okay. Let me read them for you and see if</p> <p>14 you agree or disagree with them.</p> <p>15 A Okay.</p> <p>16 Q The five separate claims as -- one,</p> <p>17 Evolution as such: This is a theory that the world is</p> <p>18 not constant nor recently created nor perpetually</p> <p>19 cycling but rather is steadily changing and the</p> <p>20 organisms are transformed in time.</p> <p>21 A Yes, I agree with that.</p> <p>22 Q You agree with that?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">148</p> <p>1 there may be other mechanisms involved in</p> <p>2 diversification that he's not mentioned here.</p> <p>3 Q Okay. And the fourth claim -- separate</p> <p>4 claim under Darwin's theory is gradualism. According</p> <p>5 to this theory, evolutionary change takes place</p> <p>6 through the gradual change of populations and not by</p> <p>7 the sudden -- I can't -- salta --</p> <p>8 A Saltation.</p> <p>9 Q -- saltational production of new individuals</p> <p>10 that represent a new type.</p> <p>11 Do you agree with that claim?</p> <p>12 A Yes, in general. Gradualism simply means</p> <p>13 change over time, and saltationism refers to almost</p> <p>14 magical or miraculous transformations that don't</p> <p>15 require long periods of time. There's an old saying</p> <p>16 that nature does not like leaps, natura non fecit</p> <p>17 saltum.</p> <p>18 Q Your Catholic upbringing is coming out.</p> <p>19 A My Italian pronunciation of Latin, natura no</p> <p>20 fecit saltum.</p> <p>21 Q And the fifth claim is the claim of natural</p> <p>22 selection. According to this theory evolutionary</p>



DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

38 (Pages 149 to 152)

<p style="text-align: right;">149</p> <p>1 change comes about through the abundant production of</p> <p>2 genetic variation in every generation. The relatively</p> <p>3 few individuals who survive, owing to a particularly</p> <p>4 well-adapted combination of inheritable characters,</p> <p>5 give rise to the next generation.</p> <p>6 A Yes.</p> <p>7 Q Do you agree --</p> <p>8 A Yes.</p> <p>9 Q -- that is a claim --</p> <p>10 A Yes.</p> <p>11 Q -- under Darwin's --</p> <p>12 A Yes.</p> <p>13 Q -- Theory of Evolution?</p> <p>14 A Yes.</p> <p>15 Q And do you also understand that advocates of</p> <p>16 intelligent design, like Michael Behe, only focus</p> <p>17 their attention on the fifth claim, and that is the</p> <p>18 claim of natural selection.</p> <p>19 A That's not accurate. There are intelligent</p> <p>20 design advocates such as Jonathan Wells who deny</p> <p>21 common descent, also.</p> <p>22 Q Correct. That's why I mention Michael Behe.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">151</p> <p>1 this case to keep in mind -- and this is something</p> <p>2 that they all agree with -- is that, scientifically</p> <p>3 speaking, natural selection and any other Darwinian</p> <p>4 factors involved in life are not adequate to explain</p> <p>5 the design in living things, and I think that's really</p> <p>6 the important point to focus on.</p> <p>7 And my point has been that, scientifically</p> <p>8 speaking, natural selection Darwinian explanations are</p> <p>9 quite enough, but that theologically speaking there's</p> <p>10 room to look at deeper levels of explanation than any</p> <p>11 science is able to explore.</p> <p>12 Q What is the distinction between Darwinism</p> <p>13 and neo-Darwinism?</p> <p>14 A As I understand it, Darwinism is a view that</p> <p>15 natural selection of undirected variations is the</p> <p>16 mechanism of -- is the explanation of living</p> <p>17 phenomena, but there are differences in the Darwinian</p> <p>18 camp as to how deeply explanatory natural selection</p> <p>19 is.</p> <p>20 For example, Stephen J. Gould argues that</p> <p>21 there are random or contingent events that occur in</p> <p>22 natural history such as the meteorite impact that</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">150</p> <p>1 Are you familiar with the idea that Michael Behe does</p> <p>2 not have any problem with common descent --</p> <p>3 A Right.</p> <p>4 Q -- but he --</p> <p>5 A Or so he says.</p> <p>6 Q Right. And he says his theory of</p> <p>7 intelligent design only is critical of the natural</p> <p>8 selection aspect of Darwin's theory. Is that a</p> <p>9 correct statement?</p> <p>10 A I believe so. That certainly sounds --</p> <p>11 sounds characteristic of Behe's approach.</p> <p>12 Q And I think you raise a good point when you</p> <p>13 say there is some that don't believe in that, and I</p> <p>14 guess one of the issues for us lawyers is how do we</p> <p>15 define these various camps, because within the camp,</p> <p>16 there are many variations --</p> <p>17 A That's right.</p> <p>18 Q -- on the issues that are at stake here.</p> <p>19 A Yes.</p> <p>20 Q Is there a way that you would define these</p> <p>21 camps that would be more intelligible for us?</p> <p>22 A Well, the -- the thing that's important for</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">152</p> <p>1 wiped out the dinosaurs 65 million years ago opening</p> <p>2 up niches for mammalian development that are also</p> <p>3 necessary to talk about when we try to explain the</p> <p>4 diversity of life that we have today so that natural</p> <p>5 selection even for Gould is not enough. And he refers</p> <p>6 to people like Richard Dawkins as hyper-Darwinists</p> <p>7 because they want to explain all characteristics of</p> <p>8 living beings in terms of their adaptive function that</p> <p>9 they performed at one time or another.</p> <p>10 So your -- your -- I haven't finished</p> <p>11 answering your -- your question --</p> <p>12 Q Go ahead.</p> <p>13 A -- again was?</p> <p>14 Q How can we -- the distinction between</p> <p>15 Darwinism --</p> <p>16 A Oh, and --</p> <p>17 Q -- neo --</p> <p>18 A -- neo-Darwinism,</p> <p>19 Q -- Darwinism. Yeah.</p> <p>20 A Okay. The distinction is that neo-Darwinism</p> <p>21 is a term used to refer to what's called the modern</p> <p>22 synthesis; the Darwinian recipe for evolution and our</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

39 (Pages 153 to 156)

<p style="text-align: right;">153</p> <p>1 modern understanding of the gene as the unit of          2 inheritance. It's called neo-Darwinism because Darwin          3 himself knew nothing about genes as the unit of          4 inheritance. That was the idea that Gregor Mendel and          5 then subsequently the history of the science and          6 genetics brought to the surface.          7 And as a result of that, Darwinism, which          8 sort of went into a kind of eclipse at the beginning          9 of the 20th century, came back stronger than ever          10 because we found the mechanism of change, the gene and          11 the mutations of genes as the raw material, if you          12 will, for evolutionary diversity.          13 Q When you say Darwinism went into an eclipse,          14 what do you mean by that?          15 A There -- because it didn't have a good          16 explanation of heredity at the beginning of the 20th          17 century, scientists were looking for other ways of          18 explaining diversification of life across time. Some          19 were experimenting with Lamarckianism, and vitalism,          20 too, was something that crept into some scientific          21 ideas. Vitalism is the view that some special          22 extranatural or supernatural force has to enter into</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">155</p> <p>1 A Any science can change people's concept of          2 God. Copernicus changed our concept of God.          3 Q What about you personally?          4 A Yes, I'm -- I'm not a flat earther.          5 Copernicus has changed my understanding of God. But          6 personally my immersion in evolutionary theory has had          7 the effect of allowing me to think of God in what I          8 would say is a much more biblical way than I did          9 before I encountered Darwinism or before I studied it          10 in depth.          11 Q There are some creationists, in quotes, that          12 will say that there can be no compatibility with          13 Darwin's theory in any concept of God. Did you          14 understand that?          15 A Yes.          16 Q And there are some Darwinists who say the          17 same thing, that there can't be any compatibility          18 between Darwin's Theory of Evolution and God?          19 A But they're saying that not as Darwinian          20 scientists; they're saying this as Darwinian          21 materialists or Darwinian naturalists, that is,          22 philosophically. They jump from science to</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">154</p> <p>1 the universe to elevate inanimate matter to the level          2 of living stuff.          3 So that was kind of, I think, an          4 illegitimate appeal to philosophy and science itself.          5 Q Which brings back the question, science has          6 never figured out how life came out of nonlife; is          7 that correct?          8 A The details of how that occurred have yet to          9 be worked out. In fact, there's much more -- we know          10 more about the origin of the universe than we do about          11 the specifics of the origin of life, but my point is          12 that we should leave plenty of room for purely          13 naturalistic explanations of that event as well,          14 because in my view of layered explanation, if we find          15 that life can be explained chemically or          16 thermodynamically or astrophysically, that does not          17 compete with, that does not interfere with a          18 theological affirmation that life came about because          19 of the creativity of God.          20 Q I think at one point you indicated that          21 Darwin or Darwin's Theory of Evolution changed          22 people's concept of God.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">156</p> <p>1 philosophy.          2 Q But it's the logical conclusion of their          3 scientific beliefs?          4 A It's not, no. It's not at all because I          5 have the same scientific beliefs as they do -- or I          6 shouldn't say beliefs -- the same scientific          7 understanding of the natural process as they do. It's          8 just that my layered understanding of explanation,          9 which they don't have, allows me to affirm the science          10 fully and at the same time allows me to believe in          11 every item of the Nicene Creed the way other          12 Christians do.          13 Q But in some logical process, even though you          14 say it's no longer science but theology or metaphysics          15 or religion, they come to the conclusion that Darwin's          16 Theory of Evolution or neo-Darwinism excludes God?          17 A They do, but that -- you have to explore          18 what they mean by God, and what they mean by God is at          19 least this idea of some sort of designing engineer,          20 which I don't think is the biblical understanding of          21 God.          22 And, so, it's because they can't reconcile</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

40 (Pages 157 to 160)

<p style="text-align: right;">157</p> <p>1 Darwinism or evolutionary biology with a specific          2 notion of God as intelligent engineering -- and they          3 use terms like engineering and design -- that they          4 reject the evolutionary view of things, just as there          5 are some -- in fact, many evolutionists who reject the          6 idea of God because they have exactly the same concept          7 of God as their intelligent design and creationist          8 opponents do. In fact, many, many evolutionary          9 biologists are still creationists at heart in their          10 understanding of ultimate reality.          11 Q But have you heard the accusation against --          12 I think it's Ken Miller, the biology textbook writer,          13 that he is a creationist at heart?          14 A Creationist can mean a lot of things.          15 Anybody who believes in a creator god could be called          16 in a broad sense a creationist, and sometimes that          17 label is thrown at people in such a fashion, but          18 creationist in the sense that it is used in this          19 controversy over Darwin means something quite          20 different.          21 Creationists in this sense do share the          22 belief of all theists that there is a divine creator,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">159</p> <p>1 Q -- is that correct?          2 A In the case of those two, that's true.          3 Q Yeah. Okay. And that gets back to how          4 difficult it is trying to focus on what is intelligent          5 design and the big tent that it has and also the big          6 tent that Darwin's Theory of Evolution has.          7 MR. WILCOX: To the extent that that          8 might be construed as a question, I object to it.          9 MR. THOMPSON: We're just having a          10 pleasant conversation here.          11 BY MR. THOMPSON          12 Q I'm going to return to your expert opinion          13 report. In your expert opinion report, Exhibit 2, you          14 define religion. Do you see that?          15 A Yes.          16 Q Actually you have a few definitions of          17 religion there, and I'm not sure --          18 A Three.          19 Q Three definitions of religion. Which          20 definition of religion do you base your opinion on?          21 A Well, the third definition of religion          22 includes the first two, but the first two do not</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">158</p> <p>1 but then after that they go on to take the story of          2 creation in the Bible as literally true, and Ken          3 Miller would never do anything like that.          4 Q Right. Is there a difference between          5 Darwin's Theory of Evolution and evolution?          6 A Sure.          7 Q What is the difference?          8 A That Darwin's Theory of Evolution is a way          9 of organizing the information that leads us to          10 recognize that there is change -- cumulative change          11 over time.          12 Q Would you agree that even most intelligent          13 design theorists would agree with evolution if we're          14 only talking about change over time?          15 MR. WILCOX: Objection.          16 THE WITNESS: I'm not sure that even          17 all of them would, but many of them do, yes.          18 BY MR. THOMPSON:          19 Q According to Behe and Dembski, the issue          20 that they're addressing is not the issue of change          21 over time --          22 A Right.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">160</p> <p>1 necessarily include the third. That's why I make          2 these distinctions. So that the first, Surrender          3 one's mind and heart to whatever is considered to be          4 of ultimate importance, yes, I accept that, but I          5 would specify it by numbers two and three, that          6 ultimate reality is also a great mystery which enfolds          7 us and grasps hold of us more than we grasp hold of          8 it. And, thirdly, I would attribute to that mystery          9 the characteristics that are represented by the          10 biblical tradition as God who makes promises and who          11 is personal and intelligent. That's where the word          12 intelligent comes in. Intelligence is a          13 characteristic of persons. That's where we first          14 experience it.          15 Q Have any other theologians accepted your          16 definitions of religion?          17 A It's not so much that they've accepted mine          18 but I have summarized theirs.          19 Q Okay. So when you talk about intelligent          20 design as being religious, it is falling into one of          21 these --          22 A All three --</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

41 (Pages 161 to 164)

<p>1 Q -- definitions?</p> <p>2 A All three definitions. It's religious in</p> <p>3 all three senses of the term.</p> <p>4 Q And your three definitions of religion is</p> <p>5 the basis for you to conclude that intelligent design</p> <p>6 is religious; is that correct?</p> <p>7 A It's -- it's a -- an abstract sketch of my</p> <p>8 reasons for concluding that intelligent design is</p> <p>9 religious, yes.</p> <p>10 Q I'm not sure I understand. What does</p> <p>11 "abstract sketch" mean?</p> <p>12 A Well, by that I mean it's a quick and dirty</p> <p>13 summary of much -- what I can -- what I would hope</p> <p>14 would be a much deeper understanding of religion than</p> <p>15 I'm able to present in one paragraph.</p> <p>16 Q Well, does intelligent design in any way</p> <p>17 discuss the characteristics of God?</p> <p>18 A The intelligent design --</p> <p>19 Q Theory.</p> <p>20 A -- as used by Behe and Dembski?</p> <p>21 Q Yeah.</p> <p>22 A It refrains from talking about specific</p>	<p>161</p> <p>1 organizes these things; isn't that true?</p> <p>2 A No. Intelligent design -- the word --</p> <p>3 intelligence itself is a concept that requires</p> <p>4 explanation. So to appeal to something as an</p> <p>5 explanation without giving an explanation of it itself</p> <p>6 scientifically is circuitous. It begs the question</p> <p>7 from a scientific point of view.</p> <p>8 Q See, the reason I raise that is because I</p> <p>9 think you talk about genes having this -- almost</p> <p>10 mind-like characteristics of surviving.</p> <p>11 A Yes.</p> <p>12 Q Of making sure --</p> <p>13 A I don't talk about genes that way.</p> <p>14 Darwinians talk about genes in that way, and I take</p> <p>15 the Darwinians to task for projecting subjectivity</p> <p>16 into what should function as purely objective,</p> <p>17 subjectless entities as far as science is concerned.</p> <p>18 So they themselves are violating principle of science</p> <p>19 when they do that.</p> <p>20 Q Keeping in mind that their -- you know,</p> <p>21 their great dislike for the theory of intelligent</p> <p>22 design, yet they are postulating some matter that</p> <p>163</p>
<p>162</p> <p>1 characteristics of God other than the notion of an</p> <p>2 ultimate intelligence that underlies the process of</p> <p>3 life.</p> <p>4 Q You know, it's interesting. They talk about</p> <p>5 intelligent cause or intelligent agency in many of</p> <p>6 their descriptions.</p> <p>7 A Uh-huh.</p> <p>8 Q Have you read that?</p> <p>9 A Yeah.</p> <p>10 Q Could it be that this intelligent cause or</p> <p>11 intelligent agency is nothing but some matter that we</p> <p>12 haven't yet discovered?</p> <p>13 A It could not be for them because they have</p> <p>14 rejected materialism which is what you've just</p> <p>15 defined. Materialism is the view that matter is all</p> <p>16 there is; that matter is the mother of all things.</p> <p>17 The word matter -- matter comes from mater, which</p> <p>18 means mother. They reject materialism, so they would</p> <p>19 themselves reject that idea.</p> <p>20 Q But in looking at the same kind of growth of</p> <p>21 Darwin's theory to present day, they may not have</p> <p>22 discovered that particular intelligent matter that</p>	<p>164</p> <p>1 basically has a mind of its own.</p> <p>2 A Not only that, they are projecting</p> <p>3 purposiveness into the natural world when science</p> <p>4 itself, methodologically, tells us to leave out</p> <p>5 purposiveness.</p> <p>6 Q What does that mean, purposiveness?</p> <p>7 A Having a goal in mind; teleology it's</p> <p>8 called. Matt Ridley, for example, says, yes, we're</p> <p>9 using teleological language. My view is that they are</p> <p>10 just as much in violation of scientific method as are</p> <p>11 the intelligent design people.</p> <p>12 Now, the Darwinians specify that they're</p> <p>13 talking only figuratively and allegorically or</p> <p>14 metaphorically but that they don't literally mean that</p> <p>15 there's intelligence involved here. But they often,</p> <p>16 nonetheless, give the impression that there is</p> <p>17 something intelligent at work. But that's something</p> <p>18 they, themselves, are often embarrassed at, and</p> <p>19 they -- the purists among them would not speak in</p> <p>20 language like that, so I'm just talking about some</p> <p>21 Darwinians.</p> <p>22 Q But the point is they're describing a</p>



DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

42 (Pages 165 to 168)

<p>165</p> <p>1 particular action in terms of intelligence.</p> <p>2 A Yes, they're using the -- our own experience</p> <p>3 of intelligent purposiveness as a kind of verbal and</p> <p>4 metaphorical framework or idea, rather, to try to get</p> <p>5 across a particular point. And the particular point</p> <p>6 is this: The particular point is that the unit of</p> <p>7 selection in evolution is not the organism or the</p> <p>8 group but it's pools of genes.</p> <p>9 When Dawkins, for example, in the selfish</p> <p>10 gene and Matt Ridley and others talking about genes</p> <p>11 striving to get into the next generation, if they were</p> <p>12 here, they would say we don't literally mean that;</p> <p>13 that there's anything intelligent going on here. It's</p> <p>14 a purely blind process, and it's just a figurative and</p> <p>15 imprecise way of speaking. But I take them to task</p> <p>16 for their imprecision just as I take -- I try to be</p> <p>17 consistent here -- I take to task the intelligent</p> <p>18 design people for injecting something subjective</p> <p>19 into --</p> <p>20 Q Because there's a commonality there, isn't</p> <p>21 there, between intelligent design theorists and those</p> <p>22 kind of --</p>	<p>167</p> <p>1 But that's not the important thing in</p> <p>2 science. Science as a language always has terms that</p> <p>3 come from human experience. The important thing for</p> <p>4 science is to be able to quantify and measure</p> <p>5 processes as much as possible. The imprecise language</p> <p>6 that Dawkins and others use is a way of -- it's a</p> <p>7 pedagogical device used to get us to think about</p> <p>8 nature in a particular way.</p> <p>9 But if you press them on this -- here's</p> <p>10 the difference. If you press them on the issue of do</p> <p>11 you really mean -- do you really believe that there</p> <p>12 are subjects there that are striving actually to get</p> <p>13 into a natural world, they would back off. If you</p> <p>14 press the intelligent design people, do you really</p> <p>15 believe there's something intelligent going on here,</p> <p>16 that there's some sort of intelligent design going on</p> <p>17 here, they would not back off.</p> <p>18 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>19 Q And that might be true, but -- but what</p> <p>20 you're -- what you're seeing as far as intelligent --</p> <p>21 molecular structures that look intelligently designed</p> <p>22 is some machine-like quality, are you not?</p>
<p>166</p> <p>1 A There's a --</p> <p>2 Q -- Darwinian --</p> <p>3 A There's a loose kind of --</p> <p>4 Q -- people --</p> <p>5 A -- acknowledge --</p> <p>6 (The Reporter asks for clarification.)</p> <p>7 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>8 Q There's a commonality between the thinking</p> <p>9 of the intelligent design theorist and the Darwinist</p> <p>10 who use those kinds of words like "striving" when</p> <p>11 they're describing genes in that they're using human</p> <p>12 terms that we can understand to describe something</p> <p>13 that's going on.</p> <p>14 MR. WILCOX: Objection.</p> <p>15 THE WITNESS: Science cannot avoid</p> <p>16 using terms -- even the term energy, mass, motion,</p> <p>17 force -- force, for example, gravity, these are all</p> <p>18 terms that come from human experience; gravitas is the</p> <p>19 Latin for experience of heaviness. That human</p> <p>20 experience was used by physics to refer to a specific</p> <p>21 characteristic of nature and the tendency of bodies to</p> <p>22 attract one another.</p>	<p>168</p> <p>1 A Yes, and even the Darwinians will admit that</p> <p>2 there's a machine-like characteristic.</p> <p>3 Q Right. And, so, the intelligent designers</p> <p>4 are using terms that we would normally associate with</p> <p>5 putting a machine together; correct?</p> <p>6 A Yes, but --</p> <p>7 Q In fact -- in fact, Francis Crick</p> <p>8 continually said, quote, Biologists must constantly</p> <p>9 keep in mind that what they see was not designed but</p> <p>10 rather evolved, end quote. Why was he saying that?</p> <p>11 MR. WILCOX: Objection. You said he</p> <p>12 continuously was saying that. I'm not sure what you</p> <p>13 mean by that.</p> <p>14 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>15 Q We know he said it once.</p> <p>16 A Well, what he's doing is what every good</p> <p>17 scientist would do at that point, and that's to allow</p> <p>18 as much as possible for naturalistic explanations and</p> <p>19 not resort to miraculous interventions when there's</p> <p>20 still plenty of room for natural explanation.</p> <p>21 Q Michael Behe would claim that he kept on</p> <p>22 saying that because they had to remind biologists that</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

43 (Pages 169 to 172)

<p>169</p> <p>1 what looked designed was not, in fact, designed; is          2 that correct?          3 A That was not designed purposively by an          4 intelligent agent.          5 Q Yes. In fact, have you heard this or seen          6 this statement by Bill Gates that talks about the DNA          7 molecule being more sophisticated than any kind of          8 program that his people have ever been able to design?          9 A Yes, by which he means high information          10 content in a DNA molecule.          11 Q Right. And isn't that one of the basis for          12 Bill Dembski's whole structure of the inference of          13 design, the high information content? He goes through          14 a -- a screening process which I don't understand.          15 You probably do better than I do.          16 A Yeah, it's the filter as he calls it --          17 Q Right.          18 A -- the -- the filter of inference; if          19 something can't be explained by chance, then it has to          20 be by law.          21 Q Right. And he places that in his book          22 called Design by Inference. I don't know if you've</p>	<p>171</p> <p>1 And the natural explanation seems to many of          2 them to be quite obvious; that the informational          3 sequence of letters and the code, the A, T, C and G,          4 the components that make up the nucleotides, that that          5 specific sequence is itself the result of a filtering          6 process that took place naturally over the course of          7 many, many millions of years in which unviable          8 sequences -- informational sequences were not selected          9 for survival and reproduction. And my own view is          10 that let's take -- let's allow -- as a theologian,          11 let's allow naturalistic explanations to be carried as          12 far as they possibly can and bring in theology at some          13 completely different level of explanation.          14 Q But don't you believe that Dembski's          15 mathematical test of probabilities where he takes for          16 granted the earth being 4 billion years old and          17 through some mathematical formula comes to the          18 conclusion that the probabilities are so astronomical          19 that these various molecular machines would have been          20 formed by chance that it's virtually impossible? Now,          21 that's a scientific -- would you consider that a          22 scientific concern?</p>
<p>170</p> <p>1 read that. Have you read that book?          2 A Not -- I'm not sure whether I've read that          3 one. I've read parts of Mere Creation and other          4 things that he's written, but I have read essays --          5 for example, he has an essay in a book that I have an          6 essay in called Debating Design, and I believe he          7 talks about the explanatory filter there, but he talks          8 about it in a number of places as well.          9 Q And this explanatory filter is something          10 that he's replicated that other mathematicians can          11 check --          12 A Right.          13 Q -- is that correct?          14 A Yes. And the point of it is to emphasize          15 the informational character of life, but even the most          16 hard-core Darwinians agree there is an informational          17 aspect to life. The question is how to go back          18 explaining it, and my impression is that biology --          19 most biologists -- in fact, almost all of them would          20 say, let's see if we can't get a purely natural          21 explanation for information before we jump to the idea          22 of intelligent design.</p>	<p>172</p> <p>1 A No, that's a philosophical conclusion. All          2 science can do is detail the material and efficient          3 causes that produce a particular outcome to make the          4 leap to -- to say, for example, that this          5 improbability requires some explanation that          6 scientists don't ordinarily deal with could be quite          7 legitimate as a claim, but not as a scientific claim.          8 Q But it -- he doesn't have to make a          9 theological claim when he concludes that it is          10 improbable that a particular molecular structure          11 occurred by natural selection. That's a scientific          12 claim, is it not?          13 A I wouldn't classify that particular          14 inference as a scientific one.          15 Q Is it a theo --          16 A It's --          17 Q Excuse me. Go ahead.          18 A It's metaphysical or implicitly          19 metaphysical. It's a view of reality. It's a world          20 view that's implied in that statement, and that world          21 view is one that says ultimately we need an          22 intelligent explanation for phenomena.</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

44 (Pages 173 to 176)

<p style="text-align: right;">173</p> <p>1 Now, there's a sense in which my own world          2 view -- theological world view would say that          3 ultimately we do need an explanation for certain          4 constraints within which natural processes work, but I          5 don't want anyone to misconstrue my statement that          6 there is as a scientific statement. I want that to be          7 understood to be a theological and/or philosophical          8 inference rather than a scientific one that goes          9 outside the bound of scientific method.          10 Q We were talking about intelligent design          11 being religious and falling within your three          12 definitions of religion in your expert report.          13 A Yes.          14 Q I think we discussed the fact that          15 intelligent design theorists do not necessarily          16 ascribe to any particular characteristic of the          17 intelligent designer; is that correct?          18 A Of God you mean?          19 Q Well --          20 A That's what you said earlier.          21 Q It may be God. Okay. Let's change it to          22 the intelligent designer.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">175</p> <p>1 A Yeah, he was trying to trace --          2 Q -- individual --          3 A -- possible cause and effect relationships          4 back to a wider context than origin of life studies          5 that he usually deals with.          6 Q The other -- so that the intelligent          7 designer could be God, a concept of God, or it could          8 be some other extraterrestrial being?          9 A Well, it wouldn't be a concept of God. A          10 concept of God is not an agent. It could be an          11 intelligent design suggests -- the term itself          12 suggests what God has always meant in western          13 philosophy and theology. That's why I say it's          14 irremediably religious and theological.          15 Q That was -- one definition was the western          16 concept of God, but your other definitions were a          17 little more vague than that.          18 A Yes, there can be -- even belief that matter          19 is all there is -- fits my first definition of          20 religion, and that's why, as I've been saying all day,          21 I'm opposed to any science or -- scientist or science          22 teacher making statements to the effect that matter is</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">174</p> <p>1 A The word itself -- the term itself          2 inevitably logically entails certain characteristics;          3 intelligence and the capacity to design purposively.          4 So, yes, it does entail specific characteristics that          5 we normally have associated with the deity.          6 Q Well, didn't Crick talk about some          7 extraterrestrial seeding the earth?          8 A But they're purely natural. The panspermia          9 theory is not in any way a theological theory. It's          10 an attempt to explain approximately how life could          11 have taken place on earth and still leaves open the          12 question, well, how did the first living cells that          13 seeded the earth become part of the natural world.          14 And a good scientist would try as hard as possible to          15 explain such an event if it is conceivable in chemical          16 terms or thermodynamical terms or astrophysical terms,          17 but not in theological terms.          18 Q Yeah, but Crick wasn't developing it in          19 theological terms.          20 A No. Right.          21 Q You were just saying that some          22 extraplanetary --</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">176</p> <p>1 all there is or even saying that Darwinian          2 explanations are the ultimate explanation of design.          3 I object to that because those two are statements that          4 refer implicitly to some ultimate level of reality.          5 Science doesn't deal with ultimate realities. It          6 deals with proximate causes.          7 Q Going further along this line of thought          8 about what is religion and referring it to intelligent          9 design, you would agree with me, will you not, that          10 intelligent design does not have moral code; is that          11 correct?          12 A Not directly, but indirectly, yes.          13 Indirectly it's telling us that, in effect, the good          14 life would consist of conformity to intelligent          15 design; that we would make our lives ordinary and          16 purposive, so implicitly any statement about ultimate          17 reality there are implicit -- there's an implicit          18 basis for ethics or kind of ethics.          19 Q But not one of the intelligent design          20 theorists has actually come out with a written moral          21 code saying this is what we believe; is that correct?          22 A As far as I know, they have not explicitly</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

45 (Pages 177 to 180)

<p style="text-align: right;">177</p> <p>1 drawn out the implications of their appeal to          2 intelligent design, and I'm not saying that they have.          3 All I'm saying is that there are implicitly ethical          4 implications in any world view.          5 Q Well, that's the same -- that holds true          6 also for the theory of evolution; isn't that correct?          7 A No, because I don't consider the theory of          8 evolution a statement about the ultimate character of          9 reality. The theory of evolution is a scientific          10 theory, and science abstracts from, leaves out,          11 considerations of ultimate explanations and of          12 purpose.          13 If you find an evolutionary biologist saying          14 that evolution is the ultimate context for our          15 self-understanding and our existence, yes, there are          16 ethical implications there, radical ethical          17 implications. But that is not science; that's          18 philosophy; that's a religion almost.          19 Q Well, if you accept it as some Darwinists          20 believe that we are here as a result of natural          21 selection, okay, and that entails the survival of the          22 fittest, isn't there the same kind of implicit moral</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">179</p> <p>1 thought and our lives. Some Darwinians have done that          2 by making Darwinian explanations the ultimate context          3 of their lives, and, so, yes, there are ethical          4 implications that flow from that. But I think that --          5 that that's -- again, it's a confusion of religion          6 with science.          7 Q Is there a sacred scripture that intelligent          8 design theorists refer to?          9 A Not directly as far as I know; at least I          10 hope they don't.          11 Q Do they have a particular liturgy?          12 A Do they have a particular liturgy? I've          13 been at some of their meetings where things go on that          14 don't go on anywhere else where there's an appeal to          15 certain authority figures that -- that they consider          16 to be almost saints in their collection of heroic          17 figures.          18 Q Who would they be?          19 A I would -- I would think Michael Polanyi for          20 Dembski, for example, has been appealed to; although,          21 as someone who's imitated Polanyi, I think Polanyi          22 would turn over in his grave that -- being appealed to</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">178</p> <p>1 code being advanced by that concept?          2 A Not at all. In fact, Stephen J. Gould          3 himself says that Darwin has liberated us from ever          4 having to search for our basis for morality in the          5 natural world. I don't happen to agree with that, but          6 to answer your question, it's not at all inevitable.          7 It's correct, I think, to say that we are          8 the outcome of natural selection just as it's correct          9 to say that the water is boiling because of molecular          10 motion of H<sub>2</sub>O. You could add to that to explain our          11 existence other deep things are going on in reality          12 that science cannot even touch upon and science should          13 leave out. So when Darwinians make Darwinism into          14 their ultimate world view -- and, in fact, many of          15 them do -- there are ethical implications which          16 deserve our -- our deepest suspicion.          17 Q You use the word ethical. What about          18 religious implications?          19 A Well, religion in the first sense of the          20 term is what they're giving us. They are -- it's          21 characteristic of the human person, of human life, to          22 look for some ultimate context in which to situate our</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">180</p> <p>1 as an authority in this area. But implicitly --          2 implicitly they're appealing to a whole tradition of          3 natural theology as the framework of their whole          4 movement, and that would include people like William          5 Paley and Thomas Aquinas. Aristotle, Thomas Aquinas,          6 these are names that come up often in their discourse.          7 Q But they wouldn't hold the same status,          8 would they, as, say, a priest in the Catholic church?          9 A Oh, I think so, yes. More so. I don't know          10 of too many Catholic intelligent design experts. Behe          11 is the only one I really know of.          12 Q What about --          13 MR. WILCOX: Any question that begins          14 "what about" I'm probably going to object to.          15 MR. THOMPSON: Okay. It's just a          16 conversation.          17 BY MR. THOMPSON:          18 Q Do the intelligent design theorists have a          19 text that is similar to the Bible?          20 A Possibly, but I couldn't specify it. Maybe          21 if I had more time to think about it there might be          22 one that keeps coming up.</p>



DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

46 (Pages 181 to 184)

<p style="text-align: right;">181</p> <p>1 Q Do they have holidays -- do intelligent  2 design theorists have holidays?  3 A No.  4 Q If you --  5 A Incidentally, I don't characterize -- I  6 never have characterized the intelligent design  7 movement as a religion. All I've said is that the  8 appeal to the notion of intelligent design is  9 nonscientific and religious in nature.  10 Q If you had such concerns about the validity  11 of the theories that Behe expounds in Darwin's Black  12 Box, why would you make your students familiar with  13 it?  14 A It's part of the task of an educator to  15 expose students to the fullest range of positions on  16 issues as possible. In my teaching I never directly  17 come out in defense of any position. I leave that to  18 the students to decide which is the most appropriate  19 position. I do include my own as one, but only one of  20 many possible positions the students could have. And  21 when I grade their exams, I grade them not on the  22 position that they hold but on how fair they are in</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">183</p> <p>1 A (Witness reviews document.) Okay.  2 Q Okay. Keeping in mind that this statement  3 is read to ninth grade biology students just before  4 they begin their section in the biology textbook on  5 evolution, I'm going to ask you sentence by sentence  6 whether you believe that those statements are true or  7 false or objectionable in any way. The first  8 statement is, The Pennsylvania academic standards  9 require students to learn about Darwin's Theory of  10 Evolution and eventually to take a standardized test  11 of which evolution is a part.  12 Do you have any problem with that statement?  13 A No.  14 Q Okay. The next paragraph, Because Darwin's  15 theory is a theory, it continues to be tested as new  16 evidence is discovered.  17 Do you have any problems with that  18 statement?  19 A Yes. The implication is that it's just a  20 theory, and that's not stated explicitly, but that, in  21 light of the whole testimony of the whole document, is  22 objectionable because we should never say just a</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">182</p> <p>1 their exposition of the full spectrum.  2 Q Now, I had asked you earlier if you had read  3 the total policy of the Dover School District as it is  4 stated in the biology curriculum press release, and  5 you indicated you had not.  6 A I don't think that I have.  7 Q Okay.  8 A I might have, but I don't know that I have.  9 Q Okay. And then I think you were reading it  10 during one of the breaks. That's Exhibit Number 3.  11 A I read part of it during a break.  12 Q Right. What I would like you to do right  13 now, Professor, is go through the statement that was  14 to be read to the students just before the -- the  15 ninth grade biology students just before they were to  16 take up the section on evolution, and then I'm going  17 to ask you some questions about that statement.  18 A Where is it?  19 Q It starts right at the bottom of this  20 (indicating) page starting with, "The Pennsylvania  21 academic standards require," and then it goes on to  22 the next page.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">184</p> <p>1 theory. We should understand a theory as an honest  2 attempt to organize information.  3 Q Well, there is no word "just" in that  4 sentence.  5 A I understand that, but --  6 Q You've added "just."  7 A I think that's implied there in the context  8 of the whole discussion.  9 Q Well, I'm talking about just this paragraph  10 now. The students are not going to be conversant with  11 our discussion.  12 A All right. If it's meant literally, yes, I  13 can accept that.  14 Q Okay. Then the next sentence says, The  15 theory is not a fact.  16 Do you have any problem with that statement?  17 A I do because, once again, the statement  18 itself shows a kind of misunderstanding of what the  19 nature of theory is and what a fact is.  20 Q Let me go further and see if that clarifies  21 that issue. "Gaps in the theory exist for which there  22 is no evidence." Is that an appropriate statement?</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

47 (Pages 185 to 188)

<p style="text-align: right;">185</p> <p>1 A That's an entirely inappropriate statement.</p> <p>2 It's fuzzy. It's logically problematic. Gap is not</p> <p>3 defined. Gap as the statement goes on turns out to be</p> <p>4 not a gap in science but a gap between two levels of</p> <p>5 understanding.</p> <p>6 Q So you do not believe there are any gaps in</p> <p>7 the theory for which there is no evidence?</p> <p>8 A That's what we've been saying all morning.</p> <p>9 I don't like to use the term gap. There's a whole --</p> <p>10 there's a whole lot more that we need to know about</p> <p>11 nature than what we actually know.</p> <p>12 Q A theory -- the next sentence, A theory is</p> <p>13 defined as a well-tested explanation that unifies a</p> <p>14 broad range of observations.</p> <p>15 Do you have any problem with that?</p> <p>16 A I can go along with that.</p> <p>17 Q Okay. Well, does that sentence itself,</p> <p>18 then, remove the concerns that you have over the use</p> <p>19 of the word "theory" in the first two sentences?</p> <p>20 A Not entirely because of this, what follows,</p> <p>21 and we have to put these sentences in context. We</p> <p>22 can't just take them as atoms isolated from their</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">187</p> <p>1 life that differs from Darwin's view.</p> <p>2 Is that acceptable?</p> <p>3 A Yeah, it differs in the same way that -- to</p> <p>4 use my example explaining the pot boiling as the</p> <p>5 consequence of my wanting tea differs from explaining</p> <p>6 it in terms of molecular motion.</p> <p>7 Now, what the statement is implying is that</p> <p>8 we should collapse those explanatory levels down to</p> <p>9 one playing field, as it were, so that intelligent</p> <p>10 design can be presented as an alternative to</p> <p>11 scientific theory. It's an alternative level of</p> <p>12 explanation. It's not an alternative -- a legitimate</p> <p>13 alternative to scientific theory.</p> <p>14 Q The next -- the next sentence is, The</p> <p>15 reference book, Of Pandas and People, is available for</p> <p>16 students who might be interested in gaining an</p> <p>17 understanding of what intelligent design actually</p> <p>18 involves.</p> <p>19 Do you have any problems with that sentence?</p> <p>20 A If it were not given in the context of a</p> <p>21 scientific classroom, I would say that it is important</p> <p>22 for the education of all of us, including students, to</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">186</p> <p>1 environment.</p> <p>2 The statement goes on to present intelligent</p> <p>3 design as a theory on the same intellectual or logical</p> <p>4 plain as an alternative to Darwinian theory. And what</p> <p>5 I've been saying all day is that they're not on the</p> <p>6 same playing field; they're not playing the same game</p> <p>7 by the same rules.</p> <p>8 Intelligent design is a concept that belongs</p> <p>9 at the level of metaphysics, religion or philosophy,</p> <p>10 but not at the level of science. And the implication</p> <p>11 of the whole paragraph is students should be exposed</p> <p>12 to alternatives to Darwinian theory. Alternatives --</p> <p>13 what kind of alternatives? Do they mean alternatives</p> <p>14 in the area of religion and philosophy or general</p> <p>15 world view? Are they implying the students should be</p> <p>16 exposed to a world view other than that that's</p> <p>17 maintained by materialist Darwinians? See, it's very,</p> <p>18 very vague and very tendentious. If they understand</p> <p>19 the intelligent design as an alternative to Darwinian</p> <p>20 science, then I deeply object to that.</p> <p>21 Q The next statement on the second page,</p> <p>22 intelligent design is an explanation of the origin of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">188</p> <p>1 explore the different levels of understanding that are</p> <p>2 available to the human mind. I do object to the</p> <p>3 implication that it should be presented to the</p> <p>4 students as an alternative to evolutionary biology.</p> <p>5 Q And then it goes on in the next paragraph,</p> <p>6 With respect to any theory, students are encouraged to</p> <p>7 keep an open mind.</p> <p>8 Do you have any problems with that</p> <p>9 statement?</p> <p>10 A No.</p> <p>11 Q Next sentence, The school leaves the</p> <p>12 discussion of origins of life to individual students</p> <p>13 and their families.</p> <p>14 Do you have any objection to that?</p> <p>15 A Yes, most families are not qualified, don't</p> <p>16 have members of families who are qualified to discuss</p> <p>17 questions relating to the scientific, chemical,</p> <p>18 physical, astrophysical, thermodynamic understandings</p> <p>19 of how physical processes take place, so I do object</p> <p>20 to that.</p> <p>21 Q Okay. As a standards-driven district --</p> <p>22 next sentence, As a standards-driven district, class</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

48 (Pages 189 to 192)

<p style="text-align: right;">189</p> <p>1 instruction focuses on preparing students to achieve</p> <p>2 proficiency on a standards-based assessment.</p> <p>3 Do you have any problems with that?</p> <p>4 A No.</p> <p>5 Q Okay. Understanding that that -- what we've</p> <p>6 just gone through is the sentence -- is the</p> <p>7 paragraph -- the four paragraphs that are read to</p> <p>8 students, do have you any opinion regarding the</p> <p>9 appropriateness of that paragraph being read to ninth</p> <p>10 grade biology students at the beginning of the</p> <p>11 evolution class?</p> <p>12 A Yes, I object to that because of the reasons</p> <p>13 that I've just detailed in your previous trail of</p> <p>14 questions.</p> <p>15 Q Okay. Then the part of the policy which</p> <p>16 goes on -- it's not a part of what is read to the</p> <p>17 students -- is as follows: The foregoing statements</p> <p>18 were developed to provide a balanced view and not to</p> <p>19 teach or present religious beliefs.</p> <p>20 A Problematic for this reason: When people</p> <p>21 write the -- use the expression "balanced view," they</p> <p>22 are often confusing different levels of explanation</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">191</p> <p>1 is illogical as I've stated in my reasons for</p> <p>2 objecting to the intelligent design approach.</p> <p>3 Q Then the statement goes on, which is part of</p> <p>4 the policy, The superintendent, Dr. Richard Nilsen,</p> <p>5 has directed that no teacher will teach intelligent</p> <p>6 design, creationism or present his or her or the</p> <p>7 board's religious beliefs.</p> <p>8 Do you have any problem with that, that</p> <p>9 statement?</p> <p>10 A Not as such.</p> <p>11 Q Much of your criticism of the policy</p> <p>12 statement, the statement that was read to the</p> <p>13 students, deals with your criticism of intelligent</p> <p>14 design as not being scientific in nature; is that</p> <p>15 correct?</p> <p>16 A Right.</p> <p>17 Q Okay. But you'll agree that there are</p> <p>18 people who say -- such as Behe and Dembski and Stephen</p> <p>19 Meyer who will say that it is scientific?</p> <p>20 A Yes, I know that.</p> <p>21 Q Okay. Now, the question -- and if that is</p> <p>22 the case, why would you expect school districts to</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">190</p> <p>1 being balanced against each other rather than two</p> <p>2 different scientific theories at the level of</p> <p>3 scientific explanation being balanced against each</p> <p>4 other.</p> <p>5 If there is a legitimate alternative in --</p> <p>6 within the field of science alone to the Darwinian</p> <p>7 explanations of life -- and there are post-Darwinian</p> <p>8 evolutionary accounts that somehow want to modify the</p> <p>9 Darwinian theory -- I have no objection to balanced</p> <p>10 treatment at that level. But what the intelligent</p> <p>11 design community usually means by balanced treatment</p> <p>12 is to balance the implicit secularism and naturalism</p> <p>13 that they see in biological expressions with an</p> <p>14 alternative to that. And the alternative to one</p> <p>15 metaphysical world view is another metaphysical world</p> <p>16 view; that's the logical alternative.</p> <p>17 What they're doing is trying to say that</p> <p>18 intelligent design fits into the category of science;</p> <p>19 therefore, we can balance it with the Darwinian view.</p> <p>20 But if intelligent design, as I've been maintaining,</p> <p>21 is something that pertains more to world view,</p> <p>22 theology and religion, then to use the term "balance"</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">192</p> <p>1 have to take sides on this controversial issue?</p> <p>2 MR. WILCOX: Objection.</p> <p>3 THE WITNESS: I don't know that I do</p> <p>4 expect school boards even to get involved in this.</p> <p>5 What school boards should be doing is making sure that</p> <p>6 in science classes students are limiting -- teachers</p> <p>7 are limiting themselves to what is scientifically</p> <p>8 knowable and that they are making sure the students do</p> <p>9 not confuse scientific questions with ultimate</p> <p>10 questions.</p> <p>11 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>12 Q First of all, you agree that this is a</p> <p>13 controversy, do you not?</p> <p>14 A The controversy over intelligent design,</p> <p>15 yes, it's a controversy.</p> <p>16 Q Yes, it's a controversy between intelligent</p> <p>17 design and Darwinian evolutionists, is it not?</p> <p>18 A It's -- logically speaking that's comparing</p> <p>19 apples to oranges in my view. What is the controversy</p> <p>20 consists of the fact that the intelligent design</p> <p>21 people are trying to wedge -- to use their own term --</p> <p>22 to wedge what is a -- what I consider to be a</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

49 (Pages 193 to 196)

<p style="text-align: right;">193</p> <p>1 theological world view into the same explanatory slot</p> <p>2 that is occupied by, and legitimately occupied by,</p> <p>3 people practicing scientific method, so that's where</p> <p>4 the controversy lies.</p> <p>5 Q Well, I've been attending a lot of debates,</p> <p>6 and there are scientists debating with scientists over</p> <p>7 intelligent design and evolution.</p> <p>8 MR. WILCOX: Objection.</p> <p>9 THE WITNESS: Well --</p> <p>10 MR. WILCOX: There's no question. He</p> <p>11 hasn't asked a question.</p> <p>12 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>13 Q Do you agree with that?</p> <p>14 MR. WILCOX: That you attended those</p> <p>15 debates? Why don't you start over and why not use the</p> <p>16 way lawyers and witnesses usually interact, by asking</p> <p>17 questions and he provides answers.</p> <p>18 MR. THOMPSON: Well, I apologize. I</p> <p>19 believe we're having a conversation, but --</p> <p>20 MR. WILCOX: Well, we're --</p> <p>21 MR. THOMPSON: -- for the --</p> <p>22 MR. WILCOX: -- not having --</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">195</p> <p>1 are inclined to conflate world view with scientific</p> <p>2 method.</p> <p>3 Q Michael Behe in his book does not talk about</p> <p>4 theology, is that correct?</p> <p>5 A I think toward the end he does make some</p> <p>6 quasi-theological statements.</p> <p>7 Q Isn't it true that he talks about the</p> <p>8 bacterial flagellum, the cilium, the blood clotting?</p> <p>9 A Yes.</p> <p>10 Q All in scientific terms; is that correct?</p> <p>11 A Up to a point, but there is a point where he</p> <p>12 becomes nonscientific, and that's in his appeal to</p> <p>13 intelligent design.</p> <p>14 Q And that's your opinion; is that correct?</p> <p>15 A Of course it's my opinion.</p> <p>16 Q Okay.</p> <p>17 MR. WILCOX: That's why he's here.</p> <p>18 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>19 Q And your opinion may not carry the kind of</p> <p>20 weight that you would hope the school board would give</p> <p>21 it; is that correct?</p> <p>22 A Quite possibly so.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">194</p> <p>1 MR. THOMPSON: -- Record --</p> <p>2 MR. WILCOX: -- a conversation.</p> <p>3 MR. THOMPSON: For the Record --</p> <p>4 MR. WILCOX: We have a court reporter</p> <p>5 here. This is a -- you have subpoenaed the witness to</p> <p>6 be here. This is not just a conversation and don't</p> <p>7 pretend it is.</p> <p>8 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>9 Q Is it true --</p> <p>10 MR. WILCOX: That would be disingenuous</p> <p>11 of you.</p> <p>12 MR. THOMPSON: Well, now you're looking</p> <p>13 at my motivation.</p> <p>14 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>15 Q Is it true that this dispute involves the</p> <p>16 scientific community, "this dispute" being intelligent</p> <p>17 design versus Darwin's Theory of Evolution?</p> <p>18 A Yes, scientists do not want intelligent</p> <p>19 design presented as scientific idea.</p> <p>20 Q And some scientists support the theory of</p> <p>21 intelligent design; is that true?</p> <p>22 A They do so, but they do so as persons who</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">196</p> <p>1 Q Have you ever dealt with a local school</p> <p>2 district?</p> <p>3 A Not at the -- not at the level of the school</p> <p>4 board, no.</p> <p>5 Q Okay. Have you ever helped a school board</p> <p>6 devise a policy dealing with curriculum?</p> <p>7 A No.</p> <p>8 Q Do you have any problem with school board</p> <p>9 members determining the curriculum of a school -- of a</p> <p>10 public high school?</p> <p>11 A You mean as a general practice in this</p> <p>12 country?</p> <p>13 Q Yes.</p> <p>14 A Not as such, no.</p> <p>15 Q Okay. Do you --</p> <p>16 A Not necessarily, I should say.</p> <p>17 Q Okay. Do you believe that school board</p> <p>18 members have to have some high degree of scientific</p> <p>19 sophistication to determine what the policy should be</p> <p>20 on, let's say, the biology curriculum in the high</p> <p>21 school?</p> <p>22 A I believe that there should be at least some</p>



DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

50 (Pages 197 to 200)

<p>197</p> <p>1 members of school boards who know -- who have          2 expertise in -- in what scientific method is. That          3 would be my ideal. I wouldn't demand it of everybody,          4 but I think at least one or two members should be          5 scientifically sophisticated.</p> <p>6 Q Do you know what kind of requirements there          7 are to become a member of the Dover High School -- the          8 Dover School District School Board?</p> <p>9 A No, not specifically. No.</p> <p>10 Q Do you know if any of those requirements          11 involve some kind of sophistication in scientific          12 theory?</p> <p>13 A No, I do not know.</p> <p>14 Q And you're aware that the textbook that the          15 school -- ninth grade school students study was Ken          16 Miller's textbook in biology?</p> <p>17 A I wasn't completely aware of that; although,          18 earlier when you were talking about textbooks, it          19 occurred to me that maybe that was Ken Miller's.</p> <p>20 Q Okay. And Ken Miller is a respected          21 biologist; is that correct?</p> <p>22 A Yes.</p>	<p>199</p> <p>1 forth. Before you were saying at the beginning of the          2 unit of evolution, and now you're saying --</p> <p>3 MR. THOMPSON: Yes, yes, on the unit on          4 evolution.</p> <p>5 THE WITNESS: It's possible that a very          6 sharp student -- although I'm not sure how many at          7 that level would be that sharp -- would be able to          8 read between the lines the way I have and would give          9 less stature to evolutionary biology than if the text          10 were not read to them. It's possible, yes.</p> <p>11 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>12 Q From the comments that you've made          13 throughout the deposition, it seems that Darwin's          14 Theory of Evolution is the only theory dealing with          15 the origin of species that must be accepted by the          16 public school system?</p> <p>17 A Forever?</p> <p>18 Q Right now.</p> <p>19 MR. WILCOX: Objection. Go ahead.</p> <p>20 THE WITNESS: I would say that the --          21 that right now because of the wide scientific          22 consensus that accepts the basic Darwinian</p>
<p>198</p> <p>1 Q And, therefore, the section on evolution          2 that involves several chapters is in some way tainted          3 by this one-minute statement; is that your opinion?</p> <p>4 A By which one-minute statement?</p> <p>5 Q The statement that was read to the students          6 contained in Exhibit 3.</p> <p>7 A That his biology textbook is tainted? I          8 don't understand.</p> <p>9 Q The students reading three chapters --          10 there's at least three chapters in the textbook that          11 relate to Darwin's Theory of Evolution.</p> <p>12 A Right.</p> <p>13 Q The students study those three chapters.</p> <p>14 A Right.</p> <p>15 Q Is it your opinion that by reading this          16 four-paragraph statement contained in Exhibit 3 that          17 the students' knowledge of evolution would be tainted?</p> <p>18 A Would be tainted if what?</p> <p>19 Q If these four paragraphs were read.</p> <p>20 A Were read to them?</p> <p>21 Q Yes, at the beginning of the biology course.</p> <p>22 MR. WILCOX: You keep going back and</p>	<p>200</p> <p>1 interpretation of evolution that it would be a great          2 deprivation of students' education if that fact were          3 not pointed out to them. At the same time, if they          4 are properly instructed in scientific method, which          5 they should be, they should realize that every          6 scientific theory is open to modification in the light          7 of new data; that they should keep an open mind about          8 that possibility, but that open-mindedness in the          9 scientific classroom should not be extended toward the          10 controversy over different world views.</p> <p>11 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>12 Q So you believe that this controversy between          13 intelligent design and evolutionists is really not a          14 scientific controversy at all but a controversy          15 between belief systems?</p> <p>16 A It's essentially that, yes, and my writing          17 God After Darwin and Deeper Than Darwin have pointed          18 that out time and again, that the controversy has to          19 do with clashes in basically religions in the first          20 sense of the term as I defined it.</p> <p>21 Q And that because prominent Darwinists today          22 are basically atheist and tie the theory of Darwinism</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

51 (Pages 201 to 204)

<p style="text-align: right;">201</p> <p>1 to their world view philosophy, that students in the          2 ninth grade should be subjected to that world view          3 without the counter-viewpoint?          4 MR. WILCOX: Objection.          5 BY MR. THOMPSON:          6 Q Is that the question -- I mean, is that the          7 answer?          8 A Everything that I've said today would say          9 no; that what students in the ninth grade should be          10 exposed to is not world views at all. If, in fact,          11 there are science teachers who are implicitly          12 embedding scientific information in a materialist or          13 atheistic world view, that is just as objectionable,          14 I've been saying all along, as embedding scientific          15 information in the theory of intelligent design.          16 Now, if these students were in a parochial          17 school where their parents are sending them to be          18 educated into a particular view of the world, then          19 these things could be pointed out, but even there not          20 in the science class but in some other educational          21 setting ideally.          22 Q So you would have no objection if</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">203</p> <p>1 Dover School Board's October 18 resolution will be to          2 compel public school teachers to present to their          3 students --          4 MR. WILCOX: You left out the word          5 science. Did you mean to?          6 MR. THOMPSON: Public school science          7 teachers. Did I miss the word science?          8 BY MR. THOMPSON:          9 Q -- teachers to present their students in          10 biology class information that is inherently          11 religious, not scientific in nature.          12 A Right.          13 Q Did you get that?          14 A Yes.          15 Q Okay. When you say "the plaintiffs are          16 entirely justified," upon what basis are you using the          17 word justified?          18 A Justified by law as well as by good critical          19 thinking.          20 Q Well, what law are you referring to?          21 A I'm referring to the -- the laws or the          22 Constitution that sets up our country in such a way as</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">202</p> <p>1 intelligent design was taught in a comparative          2 religion class?          3 A Well, in private schools --          4 Q No, in public schools.          5 A In private schools, even though I disagree          6 with creationism, as an American citizen I think          7 private Christian schools have every right to teach          8 creationism even though I think it's wrong. And I          9 suspect most scientists would agree with that, also.          10 But in public schools where we have to make          11 sure that we don't cross the separation of state and          12 religion, in order to ensure we don't cross those          13 lines, we have to be especially careful not to present          14 science packaged in any religious blanket, whether          15 that be materialism, as you pointed out before, or          16 intelligent design.          17 Q In the beginning of your expert report --          18 I'm going to the expert report now. In the beginning          19 of your expert report you say, My general opinion          20 regarding the case mentioned above is that the          21 plaintiffs are entirely justified in stating the          22 effect of the intelligent design policy adopted by the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">204</p> <p>1 to not allow religion and religious ideas to -- to          2 underlie public policy.          3 Q So that your understanding of the law is          4 that religious ideas cannot underlie public policy?          5 A That they -- that the law should not be used          6 as an instrument for a particular religious group.          7 Q That's a little different from what you just          8 said a minute ago; is that right?          9 A Permit me the clarification.          10 Q Yes, sure. So it is -- you indicated it's          11 justified by law, and what was the other thing?          12 A By critical thinking which recognizes the          13 distinction between different approaches to truth.          14 Q Well, critical thinking was one of the          15 reasons why you had your students become familiar with          16 Darwin's Black Box; isn't that correct?          17 A Yes, but I did that in the theology class,          18 not in the science class, not in a public school          19 science class.          20 Q But the idea of critical thinking --          21 A Oh, of course. Of course. Yes, there          22 should be settings in which people are allowed to</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

52 (Pages 205 to 208)

<p style="text-align: right;">205</p> <p>1 learn the difference between different approaches.</p> <p>2 Q And, in fact, isn't it true that if the</p> <p>3 students were presented with a controversy between</p> <p>4 Darwin's Theory of Evolution and the theory of</p> <p>5 intelligent design, it would make them more interested</p> <p>6 in the whole subject matter?</p> <p>7 MR. WILCOX: Objection.</p> <p>8 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>9 Q Do you believe that?</p> <p>10 MR. WILCOX: Objection.</p> <p>11 THE WITNESS: Provided that, again,</p> <p>12 you're forgetting the distinctions that I made already</p> <p>13 today that logically speaking the controversy cannot</p> <p>14 be between intelligent design and Darwinian theory.</p> <p>15 It can be between intelligent design and a world view</p> <p>16 that takes Darwinian theory to the ultimate</p> <p>17 explanation.</p> <p>18 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>19 Q But what if the teacher basically said,</p> <p>20 there's Darwin's Theory of Evolution, and you explain</p> <p>21 that theory of evolution. There's this other group of</p> <p>22 scientists today that think there is an alternative</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">207</p> <p>1 make for a more interesting science class?</p> <p>2 MR. WILCOX: Objection.</p> <p>3 THE WITNESS: No, not science class.</p> <p>4 It would make a good question for civics class,</p> <p>5 perhaps, or social science class; that would be a</p> <p>6 reasonably good discussion perhaps to have at that</p> <p>7 level.</p> <p>8 But any time you -- you deal with that,</p> <p>9 especially with ninth grade students, at that level by</p> <p>10 letting them even suspect that intelligent design is a</p> <p>11 logical alternative to Darwinian theories of life,</p> <p>12 that's just going to cause unnecessary confusion, and</p> <p>13 it's going to end up having those who are inclined</p> <p>14 toward intelligent design -- it's going to close their</p> <p>15 minds to developing a good scientific understanding of</p> <p>16 life.</p> <p>17 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>18 Q Well, would you agree that a ninth grade</p> <p>19 biology class is not to teach students to become</p> <p>20 scientists?</p> <p>21 A Well, I'm not sure that that's an accurate</p> <p>22 way of putting things. A lot of scientists have been</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">206</p> <p>1 theory called intelligent design, and it may be a</p> <p>2 scientific theory or it may be a religious theory, and</p> <p>3 I want you to give me your viewpoint and the basis for</p> <p>4 that viewpoint.</p> <p>5 Isn't that what education is all about?</p> <p>6 A That might be a good question for my</p> <p>7 students in my class on science and religion, but it's</p> <p>8 an inappropriate question to pose to students in a</p> <p>9 science class in a high school. It's just going to</p> <p>10 confuse things.</p> <p>11 Q You don't think that they are mature enough</p> <p>12 to make distinctions?</p> <p>13 A If there were a separate kind of educational</p> <p>14 situation or structure that could allow students to</p> <p>15 see the difference between different levels of</p> <p>16 explanation, that would be ideal and there would be</p> <p>17 room for that in public school education, too. I</p> <p>18 think teaching the controversy is something that might</p> <p>19 be appropriate in a high school context, but not in a</p> <p>20 science class as such.</p> <p>21 Q Just the idea of presenting the controversy,</p> <p>22 regardless of how you feel about it, wouldn't that</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">208</p> <p>1 launched into their career of science because of what</p> <p>2 they encountered in ninth grade science classes.</p> <p>3 In general, what a good science class should</p> <p>4 do is to educate students into scientific method and</p> <p>5 what a particular scientific method discovers in a</p> <p>6 particular field of inquiry.</p> <p>7 Q When you say in your next paragraph of your</p> <p>8 opinion, The main issue is whether the idea of</p> <p>9 intelligent design, (henceforth abbreviated as ID) is</p> <p>10 inherently scientific rather than religious, the main</p> <p>11 issue is whether it is inherently scientific rather</p> <p>12 than religious?</p> <p>13 A Yes.</p> <p>14 Q You go on to say, It is my considered</p> <p>15 opinion that it is not a scientific but instead an</p> <p>16 essentially religious idea. You do not give any kind</p> <p>17 of credence to Michael Behe's work, then, is that</p> <p>18 correct?</p> <p>19 A Well, any -- any theology or religion can</p> <p>20 have components in it which are very scientific, and I</p> <p>21 don't deny that there are many scientifically accurate</p> <p>22 statements that Michael Behe and William Dembski make</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

53 (Pages 209 to 212)

<p style="text-align: right;">209</p> <p>1 in their works, but what I'm rejecting is the idea</p> <p>2 that the framework of this so-called scientific study</p> <p>3 should be intelligent design rather than something</p> <p>4 that's accepted by the scientific community. And --</p> <p>5 and they've clearly made intelligent design the</p> <p>6 framework, the end-all and be-all of their arguments</p> <p>7 is to make a case for intelligent design.</p> <p>8 Q Well, isn't it true, though, that they do</p> <p>9 not consider their theory of intelligent design as</p> <p>10 totally opposed to some claims made by Darwinians;</p> <p>11 isn't that true?</p> <p>12 A Such as?</p> <p>13 Q Common descent.</p> <p>14 A Some of them. We've been over this before.</p> <p>15 Q Right. So, I mean, it is not -- it is not</p> <p>16 intelligent design or Darwinism to many of the</p> <p>17 advocates of intelligent design; is that correct?</p> <p>18 A I don't know of any exception. Every --</p> <p>19 every main proponent of intelligent design is, as I've</p> <p>20 understood it, anti-Darwinian in their explanation of</p> <p>21 how biological diversity comes about.</p> <p>22 Q That's one part of Darwinians' theory;</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">211</p> <p>1 Q A lot of your opinion deals with the</p> <p>2 religious motivations of the advocates of intelligent</p> <p>3 design.</p> <p>4 A That's one component of my analysis.</p> <p>5 Q Well, you -- you indicate on page 4, top of</p> <p>6 the page, that sentence starting with, Whether they</p> <p>7 are right or wrong in their assessment of the</p> <p>8 godliness of --</p> <p>9 A Godlessness.</p> <p>10 Q -- godlessness of contemporary culture, the</p> <p>11 ID initiative cannot be understood apart from a deep</p> <p>12 desire to defend the integrity of religion against the</p> <p>13 invasion of secularism whose spearhead seems, at least</p> <p>14 to ID proponents, to be Darwinian evolution.</p> <p>15 A Right.</p> <p>16 Q So you are viewing the validity of this</p> <p>17 theory of intelligent design in part based upon the</p> <p>18 motivation of the proponents, are you not?</p> <p>19 A I'm -- I'm saying that because, as I</p> <p>20 mentioned earlier, they're dealing here with a world</p> <p>21 view, that it's certainly legitimate to understand</p> <p>22 what are the personal motivations that underlie their</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">210</p> <p>1 correct?</p> <p>2 A That's the major part. It's the</p> <p>3 definitional part of Darwinian theory. Common descent</p> <p>4 is held by lots of people other than Darwinians.</p> <p>5 Lamarck, for example, had a theory of common descent</p> <p>6 as well. It's the mechanism of change that is</p> <p>7 problematic to the intelligent design people.</p> <p>8 Q I don't want to go over this that we've gone</p> <p>9 over before, but I think we agreed that Behe's real</p> <p>10 dispute was with the mechanism, and that was natural</p> <p>11 selection; isn't that correct?</p> <p>12 A His dispute was with the adequacy -- the</p> <p>13 scientific adequacy -- and I'm emphasizing here the</p> <p>14 word scientific adequacy -- of natural selection,</p> <p>15 which he thought needed to be supplemented by another</p> <p>16 concept which he calls intelligent design.</p> <p>17 Now, there are other evolutionists who also</p> <p>18 agree, and as a theologian I also agree, that natural</p> <p>19 selection is not enough adequately to explain what</p> <p>20 goes on in life. But from a scientific point of view,</p> <p>21 it's adequate, at least at this time in the history of</p> <p>22 science.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">212</p> <p>1 preoccupations; that we can't really understand what</p> <p>2 they're doing culturally, socially, religiously and</p> <p>3 theologically unless we recognize, as they themselves</p> <p>4 almost invariably admit, that they see Darwinism as</p> <p>5 fundamentally identical with atheism. And that,</p> <p>6 therefore, in order to combat atheism, we need to</p> <p>7 combat Darwinism.</p> <p>8 Q However, did we not agree before that the</p> <p>9 motivations of a particular advocate --</p> <p>10 A If you'll recall --</p> <p>11 Q -- do not really affect the validity of the</p> <p>12 particular theory they're advocating; isn't that</p> <p>13 correct?</p> <p>14 A If you recall, I made a distinction that in</p> <p>15 scientific theories the personal coefficient should</p> <p>16 not be brought in as a factor in assessing the</p> <p>17 validity of a particular idea, but that in</p> <p>18 understanding the genesis of a world view, as many</p> <p>19 philosophers would agree, we cannot disassociate those</p> <p>20 ideas from the motivational factors that gave rise to</p> <p>21 those ideas.</p> <p>22 Q So you --</p>



DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

54 (Pages 213 to 216)

<p style="text-align: right;">213</p> <p>1 A That's a very complex analysis if you were          2 going to do it in a more scholarly way, but ideology          3 as we've known for the last -- especially since the          4 19th century is not independent of certain economic,          5 social, psychological, educational and religious          6 factors.          7 Q Isn't that really basically an argument ad          8 hominem?          9 A No, I don't think --          10 MR. WILCOX: Objection.          11 THE WITNESS: -- it's ad hominem. It's          12 an attempt to understand the genesis of an idea in the          13 same way that a scientist wants to understand the          14 genesis of life. You want to understand all the          15 factors that are involved.          16 BY MR. THOMPSON:          17 Q But I guess the question is what does that          18 have to do with whether intelligent design is a valid          19 scientific theory?          20 A It has to do with the fact that what is          21 really a religious idea is presented as a scientific          22 theory. In other words, knowing the motivation behind</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">215</p> <p>1 distinguish between scientific ideas and world views.          2 And world views are incapable of being understood          3 except in the context of the particular concerns, the          4 particular preoccupations of those who are -- are          5 trying to educate us into their world view, and their          6 particular preoccupation is that atheist materialism          7 is taking over our culture. I mean, this is so          8 prominent in their statements that it cannot be          9 ignored if we're trying to be objective about what          10 intelligent design -- the intelligent design movement          11 is after.          12 BY MR. THOMPSON:          13 Q Well, I can't think of a specific scientific          14 theory, but it would seem to me like evaluating some          15 rocket propulsion theory and attacking it because some          16 Nazis promoted it.          17 A Well, you know, science is very complex,          18 too, and we haven't really gotten in depth into it,          19 but what scientists find interesting to explore is          20 itself, also, as Michael Polanyi has pointed out, not          21 always the consequence of objective thinking but of          22 personal and social preoccupation. So there is a</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">214</p> <p>1 intelligent design, it's not the only factor in          2 assessing the validity of it, I would agree, but it's          3 a relevant factor because of the fact that the          4 intelligent design people themselves say that we need          5 to do something to get people away from secularist          6 ideology. Let's start -- let's wedge -- read --          7 Phillip Johnson, William Dembski, more so than Michael          8 Behe, would argue that we need to start with the          9 classroom so the students get -- don't get Darwinian          10 thought into their head because that becomes a holding          11 place for materialist ideology.          12 Q Well, I won't push the point, but, again it          13 seems that the validity of their argument is being          14 based upon what their motivations are rather than the          15 actual scientific doctrine that it is based on.          16 MR. WILCOX: That is a conclusion you          17 might draw. That's not a question.          18 BY MR. THOMPSON:          19 Q Isn't that true?          20 MR. WILCOX: Objection. That you think          21 that? It may be true that you think that.          22 THE WITNESS: Again, I want to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">216</p> <p>1 social dimension to science, too, and it's quite          2 legitimate in order to understand, for example, why a          3 particular theory arises at a particular time in          4 history for the sociologists' knowledge to try to          5 explore what are the factors -- the extrascientific          6 factors that are involved in the kind of          7 preoccupations that lead the scientific community this          8 way or that way.          9 So even in -- in a less intense way what I          10 said about the understanding the motivations of -- of          11 the intelligent design community could also be applied          12 even to certain things that go on in the scientific          13 world, not necessarily a particular mathematical          14 equation, but the particular bias toward a particular          15 scientific theory. That's a possibility.          16 Q Going down in B, Section B of your report,          17 it says -- page 4 -- Historically it is impossible to          18 separate ID from the religious and theological          19 tradition in which it was born and nurtured over the          20 course of centuries.          21 Again it seems that you're basing your          22 opinion on the religious aspects or the religious</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

55 (Pages 217 to 220)

<p style="text-align: right;">217</p> <p>1 motivations of the proponents; is that true?</p> <p>2 A Of which proponents? Proponents –</p> <p>3 Q Of intelligent –</p> <p>4 A – of natural –</p> <p>5 Q – design.</p> <p>6 A – theology or intelligent design.</p> <p>7 Q Intelligent design.</p> <p>8 A Well, I'm talking here, especially in this</p> <p>9 paragraph if you read on, about natural theology. And</p> <p>10 the preoccupation of natural theology has always been</p> <p>11 to see if we can find in nature support for our</p> <p>12 religious ideas. And this is what I'm saying is</p> <p>13 characteristic of the intelligent design community and</p> <p>14 movement, also; that they're looking – implicitly</p> <p>15 they're practicing natural theology by trying to say</p> <p>16 that the book of nature is as sure a way to God</p> <p>17 perhaps as the book of scripture.</p> <p>18 Q Well, what do you mean, then, by your</p> <p>19 sentence in the middle of that paragraph, The</p> <p>20 contemporary notion of intelligent design is</p> <p>21 historically unintelligible apart from the religious</p> <p>22 agenda?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">219</p> <p>1 Thomas Aquinas said when he finished his argument from</p> <p>2 design and concluded to an intelligent designer, which</p> <p>3 incidentally he was doing as a philosopher and</p> <p>4 theologian, natural theologian; that when he appeals</p> <p>5 to the notion of intelligent design, he says, this is</p> <p>6 what all men understand to be God. So he took it as</p> <p>7 self-evident that anybody – anybody in his time who</p> <p>8 would conclude to an intelligent designer would</p> <p>9 immediately see that that correlates with the Creator</p> <p>10 God of biblical religion. That's why it seems to me</p> <p>11 to be terribly artificial and even capricious for the</p> <p>12 intelligent design people to expect that everybody</p> <p>13 today would make a different conclusion from what</p> <p>14 people in Thomas Aquinas' day did.</p> <p>15 Then everybody – everybody understands this</p> <p>16 to be God in the 13th century. Why would people in</p> <p>17 the 20th century and the 21st century conclude that</p> <p>18 they're talking about something different from what</p> <p>19 all these centuries have identified with intelligent</p> <p>20 design?</p> <p>21 Q Well, one of the reasons maybe is because</p> <p>22 the proponents themselves say it isn't; isn't that</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">218</p> <p>1 A That's what I just –</p> <p>2 Q Paley and – and you're again tying it to a</p> <p>3 religious agenda or motivation, is it not?</p> <p>4 A Natural theology has a religious agenda</p> <p>5 underlying it, and that religious agenda, as I've just</p> <p>6 articulated, is to show that there are reasons in</p> <p>7 science and nature, or reasons in nature, broadly</p> <p>8 speaking, for the beliefs that we hold on the basis of</p> <p>9 revelation. So natural theology, from the beginning,</p> <p>10 has been an attempt to uphold the ideas of revelation.</p> <p>11 There has never been, as far as I know, a natural</p> <p>12 theology that has functioned independently of some</p> <p>13 overarching revelatory system or religious system.</p> <p>14 Q Then going on to the next paragraph,</p> <p>15 Historically the notion of intelligent design has</p> <p>16 persistently been taken to mean the Creator God of</p> <p>17 theistic faith, end of quote.</p> <p>18 Again bringing in the religious aspects of</p> <p>19 this theory, and that is the – I guess the religious</p> <p>20 foundations of the theory and using that as a basis</p> <p>21 for your opinion; is that correct?</p> <p>22 A Well, I'm – I'm appealing directly to what</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">220</p> <p>1 true?</p> <p>2 A They do so – they do say that, yes.</p> <p>3 Q In fact, you have it in your report?</p> <p>4 A Yes, they do say this, but they do so, and I</p> <p>5 think, entirely ingenuously, and in doing so they are</p> <p>6 forcing language to function in ways that it simply</p> <p>7 cannot function for most people.</p> <p>8 Q And, again, that comment goes to what their</p> <p>9 motivations are; is that correct?</p> <p>10 A I – yes, I think that's connected.</p> <p>11 Everything is connected to their motivations.</p> <p>12 Q You come to the conclusion – not the</p> <p>13 conclusion, but down further on page 5, quoting,</p> <p>14 Moreover, no good scientist would ever claim that</p> <p>15 scientific experiment detects intelligent causes, as</p> <p>16 Dembski claims.</p> <p>17 So you are not – so by that am I to</p> <p>18 conclude that you do not believe Michael Behe is a</p> <p>19 good scientist?</p> <p>20 A No, I didn't say that at all. That doesn't</p> <p>21 follow at all from what I've said here. When he's</p> <p>22 doing biochemistry, he's a good scientist. When he</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

56 (Pages 221 to 224)

<p>221</p> <p>1 appeals to intelligent design, he's not a good  2 scientist.  3 Q Well, let's -- I'm reading the entire  4 sentence, and you don't make that kind of distinction  5 in that sentence.  6 A Well, what's implicit in this sentence is  7 what I've been saying all day; that science can only  8 deal with what it can observe in the area of efficient  9 and material causes. When you bring in the notion of  10 intelligent cause, that's similar to bringing in  11 Aristotle's notions of formal and final cause which  12 are causes which science deliberately said and has  13 persistently said science cannot deal with and should  14 not deal with. So these -- these are terms --  15 intelligent cause and intelligent design are terms  16 that Aristotle and Aquinas would have liked, but  17 they're doing philosophy; they're not doing science.  18 Q In the middle of page 6 you say -- or write,  19 I should say, Throughout the modern period --  20 MR. WILCOX: Where are you?  21 MR. THOMPSON: In the middle of the  22 third paragraph down in the middle of page 6.</p>	<p>223</p> <p>1 Q That should not be in the textbook on  2 science; is that correct?  3 A I don't know whether I would say that. It's  4 okay, and even as I mentioned earlier, no scientific  5 discourse is ever going to be pure. As you mentioned  6 before, Darwin's own origin of species has lots of  7 asides that are philosophical, so I would not hold  8 anybody to -- who's writing a high school textbook  9 to -- to such rigorous discipline as leaving out any  10 statement that has to do with values. That's --  11 that's not humanly possible.  12 But the point is that it's not a scientific  13 statement; that's a value statement.  14 Q In fact, science and human values are very  15 closely connected; isn't that true?  16 A They're connected but they're distinct.  17 Q When you talk about the current issue over  18 stem cell research --  19 A Right.  20 Q -- that is both a scientific issue and an  21 issue of values, is it not?  22 A Certainly.</p>
<p>222</p> <p>1 MR. WILCOX: Thank you.  2 BY MR. THOMPSON:  3 Q Throughout the -- I lost my place.  4 A Third line from the top.  5 Q Throughout the modern period scientific  6 method has refused to use categories such as purpose,  7 God, intelligence, value, meaning, importance, et  8 cetera, and has attempted to understand all phenomena  9 in a very limited, impersonal and, indeed, physical  10 way.  11 A Yes.  12 Q Now, you haven't read -- I don't think  13 you've read Ken Miller's biology textbook; is that  14 correct?  15 A No, I've read his book Finding Darwin's God.  16 Q Right. I'm talking about a biology textbook  17 that the students read.  18 A No.  19 Q If that biology textbook talks about the  20 need to protect extinct animals, is that a value or  21 political statement?  22 A It's a value statement.</p>	<p>224</p> <p>1 MR. WILCOX: Objection.  2 BY MR. THOMPSON:  3 Q When you talk about the need to protect the  4 environment, that is a value statement, is it not?  5 A Yes.  6 Q The need to -- when you talk about the need  7 to control population growth, that's a value  8 statement, is it not?  9 A Yes.  10 Q Would it surprise you that all these issues  11 are raised in Ken Miller's biology textbook?  12 A No, because he's trying to show -- what he's  13 doing and what any good educator would do is to show  14 the relevance of studying the scientific aspects of  15 population and environment. As I mentioned before,  16 in -- in science, generally speaking, the question of  17 why a particular study is interesting at all is not  18 itself a scientific question. It's a question of  19 motivation. So what he's doing there is implicitly  20 giving the students a good reason from their concrete  21 actual life as to why they should make themselves  22 educated on the scientific aspects of environmentalism.</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

57 (Pages 225 to 228)

<p style="text-align: right;">225</p> <p>1 and so forth.</p> <p>2 Q And that goes back to what the purpose of a</p> <p>3 ninth grade biology class is about; isn't that true?</p> <p>4 A Well, any — any class. Even the collegiate</p> <p>5 level when you teach science, it's helpful for the</p> <p>6 teacher to show why it's relevant to know the science.</p> <p>7 As long as you distinguish between values and the</p> <p>8 science, that's fine.</p> <p>9 Q You're familiar with the concept of the Big</p> <p>10 Bang?</p> <p>11 A Yes.</p> <p>12 Q Is that a scientific theory?</p> <p>13 A Big Bang Theory, it certainly is.</p> <p>14 Q Does that also have religious implications?</p> <p>15 A Every scientific idea has religious</p> <p>16 implications. That's what I've been saying all day.</p> <p>17 Q Okay. Because it does have scientific</p> <p>18 implications, would you keep it out of the science</p> <p>19 books in high school?</p> <p>20 MR. WILCOX: You mean --</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: You mean because it has</p> <p>22 religious implications?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">227</p> <p>1 rather than smooth. Why is the sky dark at night when</p> <p>2 we go out? There's many, many questions that the Big</p> <p>3 Bang Theory suddenly was able to answer in a simple</p> <p>4 and eloquent movement of the human mind, just like</p> <p>5 Darwin's theory in just a very simple theory was able</p> <p>6 to answer a whole lot of questions that people had</p> <p>7 been raising about the fossil record, about why</p> <p>8 there's sharks' teeth up in mountains and so forth and</p> <p>9 so on.</p> <p>10 That's the nature of a good scientific</p> <p>11 theory, to suddenly and swiftly and eloquently tie</p> <p>12 together and bring closure in a way to many kinds of</p> <p>13 questions that have been simmering for a long, long</p> <p>14 period of time.</p> <p>15 Q Well, isn't it true that part of the Big</p> <p>16 Bang theory is that the universe had a beginning?</p> <p>17 A That's not a necessary part of the theory.</p> <p>18 If you read carefully certain physicists like Stephen</p> <p>19 Hawking, for example, and Andre L��arde and other</p> <p>20 physicists today, Big Bang cosmology is like</p> <p>21 evolution; something that has almost an endless future</p> <p>22 of possible exploration. But the idea that the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">226</p> <p>1 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>2 Q Yes.</p> <p>3 A No, I don't understand your question.</p> <p>4 Q Well, the Big Bang Theory is what? What is</p> <p>5 the Big Bang Theory?</p> <p>6 A You'll have to specify what you mean by</p> <p>7 "what."</p> <p>8 Q What does the Big Bang Theory consist of?</p> <p>9 A I'm not sure if you can --</p> <p>10 Q What's the concept behind the Big Bang</p> <p>11 Theory?</p> <p>12 A The scientific concept --</p> <p>13 Q Yes.</p> <p>14 A -- the philosophical, theological, what.</p> <p>15 Q The scientific concept behind the Big Bang</p> <p>16 Theory.</p> <p>17 A It's not one scientific concept. The Big</p> <p>18 Bang Theory is a product of a convergence of a number</p> <p>19 of questions that have been asked for many, many years</p> <p>20 like Olber's paradox, and why the universe would be</p> <p>21 expanding, and why the universe has to -- has kind of</p> <p>22 an unstructured, cottage cheese-like characteristic</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">228</p> <p>1 universe had a crisp beginning is one that many</p> <p>2 scientists have drawn from -- from their study of the</p> <p>3 data, yes.</p> <p>4 Q Isn't it correct that up to the beginning of</p> <p>5 the 20th century most scientists believed the universe</p> <p>6 was perpetual, that it had no beginning --</p> <p>7 A Many --</p> <p>8 Q -- that it was unchanging?</p> <p>9 A Many philosophers from Aristotle, from Plato</p> <p>10 and the Stoics and more recently many materialist</p> <p>11 philosophers, including Einstein himself, believed</p> <p>12 that the universe was eternal and everlasting.</p> <p>13 Q And then it was all at once where -- I</p> <p>14 forgot -- the spectrum of light --</p> <p>15 A The red-shift phenomena.</p> <p>16 Q The red-shift phenomena led some scientists</p> <p>17 to believe that this was a phenomenon you see with an</p> <p>18 explosion and then developed this whole --</p> <p>19 A Well, if you trace --</p> <p>20 Q -- concept of --</p> <p>21 A -- the universe --</p> <p>22 Q -- (inaudible)?</p>



DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

58 (Pages 229 to 232)

<p style="text-align: right;">229</p> <p>1 A — back along the lines of expansion to an          2 earlier time, at one point it would be a little bit          3 more compact, further back it would be more compact,          4 and ultimately it would have been an almost infinitely          5 hot and dense particle or atom of matter that          6 exploded, if you want to use that term, as the Big          7 Bang.          8 Q And isn't it true that some scientists          9 refuse to accept that because it had connections with          10 religion?          11 A There were a few scientists who thought that          12 because the author of the Big Bang idea was a Belgian          13 priest, George Lemaitre, who suggested it to Einstein,          14 and Einstein thought he was a buffoon, and other          15 scientists thought — one scientist, for example, I          16 forget who it was, said it's not for nothing that this          17 idea came from a Roman Catholic priest.          18 Q And it's consistent with the concept that          19 God created the heavens and the earth; is that true?          20 A Yes, but even an eternally existing          21 universe, as Thomas Aquinas himself said, would be          22 consistent with the notion of a divine creator. So if</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">231</p> <p>1 the differentiations in temperature in the microwave          2 background radiation that was the afterglow of the Big          3 Bang itself, and by measuring the differentiations in          4 temperature was able to explain why we live in what I          5 call the cottage cheese-type universe rather than a          6 smooth one.          7 And I still remember sitting in my office in          8 Georgetown in April of 1992 and media were calling me,          9 and Stephen Hawking was saying this is the most          10 important discovery ever in the history of science,          11 and Robert Smoot, the director of the COBE project,          12 was saying, there are theological consequences here          13 and so forth. It's tempting sometimes for scientists          14 to jump to theological conclusions like that.          15 But, anyway, my point is that it's because          16 of further observation that the Big Bang Theory is now          17 more firmly established than ever, and that's why from          18 the point of view of evolution, a good evolutionist is          19 not afraid to go out and look at the data because the          20 data should either confirm or falsify the hypothesis.          21 Science is open to falsification.          22 Q And your story about the Big Bang Theory</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">230</p> <p>1 we find out tomorrow that the Big Bang never happened,          2 it would not in any sense of the word at all affect          3 the Doctrine of Creation.          4 Q Which goes back to the idea that science is          5 always — is always tentative —          6 MR. WILCOX: Objection.          7 BY MR. THOMPSON:          8 Q — that we're always learning; is that          9 correct?          10 MR. WILCOX: Objection.          11 THE WITNESS: Well, if it's scientific,          12 it is — as they say, it's underdetermined by the          13 data; that is to say, as new data coming in, they have          14 to be taken into account. And the same is already          15 happening with respect to the Big Bang Theory.          16 BY MR. THOMPSON:          17 Q That it's changing?          18 A Well, that it's undergoing — actually, in          19 fact, since 1992 it has been firmed up more thoroughly          20 than ever before by the COBE Satellite, which is a          21 good example of how observation is so necessary in          22 science. The COBE satellite was sent up to measure</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">232</p> <p>1 being discovered by a Belgian priest —          2 A Not discovered, but he was a mathematician.          3 That's a good example of how mathematics and          4 observation come together.          5 Q How would you say he developed the theory —          6 A He developed the theory that the universe          7 began in what he called a primeval atom. He didn't          8 call it the Big Bang.          9 Q And this theory — his theory was ridiculed          10 as a theory of a buffoon; is that correct?          11 A Oh, at first Albert Einstein, because of his          12 own bias towards an everlasting universe, was          13 suspicious of it, but Einstein himself didn't suspect          14 it was because of Lemaitre's religion. It was some          15 other physicist. I can't remember who it was who said          16 it.          17 Q But the point is that this theory that is          18 now widely accepted and is being corroborated more and          19 more, at the time it started was made fun of by some          20 of the greatest scientists in the world in the history          21 of the world; is that correct?          22 A Yes, Fred Hoyle to his very dying day</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

59 (Pages 233 to 236)

<p style="text-align: right;">233</p> <p>1 rejected it, but that's true of every scientific idea.</p> <p>2 I said scientific idea, not religious idea.</p> <p>3 Q But would you agree -- this is sort of like</p> <p>4 a Darwinian conclusion. Would you agree that your</p> <p>5 entire argument against this particular policy --</p> <p>6 A Intelligent design policy you're talking</p> <p>7 about?</p> <p>8 Q Yes. Well, you call it the intelligent</p> <p>9 design policy. I call it the biology curriculum, but</p> <p>10 the policy we're talking about.</p> <p>11 MR. WILCOX: And you're referring to</p> <p>12 the Dover Area School Board --</p> <p>13 MR. THOMPSON: The school policy.</p> <p>14 MR. WILCOX: -- Policy, Exhibit 3?</p> <p>15 MR. THOMPSON: Right, Exhibit 3.</p> <p>16 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>17 Q Your entire argument against that particular</p> <p>18 policy would fall apart if the theory of intelligent</p> <p>19 design were deemed to be scientific?</p> <p>20 MR. WILCOX: Objection.</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: I wouldn't put it that</p> <p>22 way at all because anybody can deem it to be</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">235</p> <p>1 an enormous scientific community.</p> <p>2 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>3 Q And if the consensus -- and we had discussed</p> <p>4 this before. And if the consensus of the scientific</p> <p>5 community becomes intelligent design is a scientific</p> <p>6 theory, then your entire argument against Dover's</p> <p>7 policy would fall apart; isn't that true?</p> <p>8 MR. WILCOX: Objection.</p> <p>9 THE WITNESS: It's such a preposterous</p> <p>10 proposal. It's like, you know, saying, you know, if</p> <p>11 suddenly the scientific community decided that the</p> <p>12 moon is made of green cheese, that we would have to</p> <p>13 accept the fact that the moon was made of green</p> <p>14 cheese. We have to keep in mind the idea of what can</p> <p>15 pass muster in principal as scientifically acceptable</p> <p>16 discourse, and in principle, not just in fact, but in</p> <p>17 principle, intelligent design will never -- I am</p> <p>18 absolutely sure of this -- will never pass muster as a</p> <p>19 scientific idea.</p> <p>20 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>21 Q As probably as sure as Einstein was that</p> <p>22 there was no Big Bang?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">234</p> <p>1 scientific. The intelligent design people deem it to</p> <p>2 be scientific. That doesn't make it scientific.</p> <p>3 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>4 Q Well, held as scientific by a court?</p> <p>5 MR. WILCOX: Objection.</p> <p>6 THE WITNESS: A court does not decide</p> <p>7 what is scientifically acceptable.</p> <p>8 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>9 Q Held scientifically by the Academy of</p> <p>10 Sciences?</p> <p>11 A You're getting warmer, but even so, what</p> <p>12 makes it scientific or not is a whole history of</p> <p>13 testing the hypothesis against the data.</p> <p>14 Q Well, the question -- well, I assume you</p> <p>15 would agree that we can only look at what the</p> <p>16 scientific community consensus is at a particular</p> <p>17 given time, would you not?</p> <p>18 MR. WILCOX: You mean we can't predict</p> <p>19 the future?</p> <p>20 MR. THOMPSON: Right.</p> <p>21 THE WITNESS: Certainly what passes as</p> <p>22 science is -- is determined by the cooperative work of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">236</p> <p>1 A Well, all of us can be wrong. I'm a</p> <p>2 fallible human being, but when I say that, I'm saying</p> <p>3 that as certainly as I believe anything.</p> <p>4 Q I mean, it's all -- everything is relative,</p> <p>5 is it not, as far as what we know or what we think we</p> <p>6 know based on the fact that our brains are still</p> <p>7 evolving; is that true?</p> <p>8 A Let me put it this way: It's honest and</p> <p>9 humble of us to admit that our ideas of anything are</p> <p>10 relative to our situation, our degree of learning, our</p> <p>11 methods and so forth. So there is -- yes, there's a</p> <p>12 certain relativity in all knowledge, including</p> <p>13 religious knowledge, but that's not the same thing to</p> <p>14 say that all things are relative. All it's saying is</p> <p>15 that our knowledge of truth is relative, not the truth</p> <p>16 is --</p> <p>17 Q That's what I meant to say, yes.</p> <p>18 A -- not the truth is not real.</p> <p>19 Q I think in your book you make mention of the</p> <p>20 fact that 90 percent of the scientists in the Academy</p> <p>21 of Science are either --</p> <p>22 A The National Academy of Sciences.</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

60 (Pages 237 to 240)

<p>237</p> <p>1 Q -- are either agnostic or atheists?</p> <p>2 A I think that's close to the figure that I</p> <p>3 saw in one of the recent reports, and it's also</p> <p>4 interesting to note that among scientists biologists</p> <p>5 are more inclined to be atheistic than physicists and</p> <p>6 chemists.</p> <p>7 Q Do you have any theory as to why that is?</p> <p>8 A I have a very strong theory as to why it is.</p> <p>9 I think there are many scientists, as I've been saying</p> <p>10 all along today, who think that Darwinism is</p> <p>11 implicitly atheistic. That Darwinian explanations --</p> <p>12 if you can come to the belief that natural selection</p> <p>13 is the ultimate explanation of living diversity, then</p> <p>14 that itself is already a religious belief. So it</p> <p>15 follows, then, that if natural selection is the</p> <p>16 ultimate explanation of life, there's no room for what</p> <p>17 theists refer to as God as ultimate explanation.</p> <p>18 And there's no question today that Darwinism</p> <p>19 does appeal to an atheistic mentality. That does not</p> <p>20 make evolution atheistic. It makes a certain</p> <p>21 interpretation of evolution atheistic.</p> <p>22 Q Well, it seems to be -- it seems to have a</p>	<p>239</p> <p>1 outgrown his fundamentalism religiously. He's still</p> <p>2 placing his fundamentalism into competition with his</p> <p>3 Darwinian understanding. So in doing that, he is just</p> <p>4 as illogical, just as thoroughly mistaken as the</p> <p>5 intelligent design people in confusing ideology with</p> <p>6 science.</p> <p>7 (Recess -- 3:20 p.m.)</p> <p>8 (After recess -- 3:34 p.m.)</p> <p>9 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>10 Q What is your definition of cheating -- uh,</p> <p>11 cheating -- teaching?</p> <p>12 A Well, from the word education to lead out</p> <p>13 and bring to the surface what I would call the desire</p> <p>14 to know, desire that's latent in all of us, but which</p> <p>15 can be easily suppressed by all sorts of other factors</p> <p>16 in life. And after getting students to become aware</p> <p>17 of their own desire to know, to have them realize how</p> <p>18 many different avenues this desire can travel down as</p> <p>19 it reaches out toward the real, toward the truth, and</p> <p>20 that means differentiating carefully between methods</p> <p>21 of inquiry, such as science, philosophy, mathematics,</p> <p>22 theology, poetry, art and so forth.</p>
<p>238</p> <p>1 great impact on the biologists, does it not, though --</p> <p>2 A What, the --</p> <p>3 Q -- the (inaudible) --</p> <p>4 A -- study --</p> <p>5 Q -- as to their religion?</p> <p>6 A Yes, but it's not the biology that's</p> <p>7 impacting; it's the implicit ideology that Stephen</p> <p>8 Gould, for example, you mentioned earlier, says that</p> <p>9 Darwinism has a philosophical message which is in</p> <p>10 Gould's mind inseparable from the science itself, and</p> <p>11 that philosophical message includes the idea that</p> <p>12 matter is all there is; that there's no purpose in the</p> <p>13 universe and so forth.</p> <p>14 But Stephen Gould is wrong on that point.</p> <p>15 Stephen Gould is not being a scientist when he says</p> <p>16 that. He's being a philosopher.</p> <p>17 Q Well, the biologist E.O. Wilson also</p> <p>18 puts Darwin's science in direct competition with --</p> <p>19 A E.O. Wilson is another one. E.O. Wilson is</p> <p>20 a creationist at heart, and he is -- he is woefully</p> <p>21 and appallingly uneducated in religion and theology.</p> <p>22 He, himself, grew up as a fundamentalist. He's never</p>	<p>240</p> <p>1 Q If you said, I'm going to teach a course on</p> <p>2 science and theology, what would you mean by the term</p> <p>3 "I'm going to teach"? I'm looking for the definition</p> <p>4 of teach.</p> <p>5 A That I'm going to try to be a guide as</p> <p>6 students approach the various ways in which the</p> <p>7 natural world can be understood -- when I talk about</p> <p>8 science, I mean the natural sciences -- and how the</p> <p>9 outcomes of natural science themselves might raise</p> <p>10 questions that require deeper levels of inquiry than</p> <p>11 science itself can illuminate. And among these</p> <p>12 theology would be one.</p> <p>13 Q Now, when you say you're going to teach a</p> <p>14 course, what factors would you view as necessary for</p> <p>15 the concept of teaching?</p> <p>16 A Factors of the -- the students. First of</p> <p>17 all, you need a body of students who have innately a</p> <p>18 desire for understanding and truth; and, secondly, you</p> <p>19 need a teacher who has been apprenticed to other</p> <p>20 teachers and who has read widely in particular</p> <p>21 disciplines and can function both as a scout and as a</p> <p>22 scout master in terms of opening up the world to</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

61 (Pages 241 to 244)

<p>1 students.</p> <p>2 Q As you probably know that not every high</p> <p>3 school student wants to learn, but yet teachers have</p> <p>4 to teach; is that correct?</p> <p>5 A Sure.</p> <p>6 Q And eliminating for the moment the student</p> <p>7 equation in this definition, what do teachers have to</p> <p>8 do to teach?</p> <p>9 A They have to themselves, first of all, be</p> <p>10 able to make distinctions. They must themselves have</p> <p>11 a desire to be excited by learning and knowledge and</p> <p>12 the ability to communicate that almost by contagion to</p> <p>13 their students. Students have to -- this has been my</p> <p>14 experience. What -- what has been most effective to</p> <p>15 many students that I've had over the years is that</p> <p>16 they see how excited I am personally about a specific</p> <p>17 topic, and that leads them to think, well, maybe I</p> <p>18 should get involved in this. I should read; I should</p> <p>19 do my work, my assignments, and see where it leads.</p> <p>20 I suspect that even a secondary level school</p> <p>21 teacher has to do something like that as well. Not</p> <p>22 having taught secondary school, I can only speculate.</p>	<p>241</p> <p>1 intelligent design has been mentioned, would you say</p> <p>2 that that is teaching students intelligent design?</p> <p>3 A Just to mention the word "intelligent</p> <p>4 design"?</p> <p>5 Q Uh-huh.</p> <p>6 A No.</p> <p>7 Q I guess that's what I'm getting at. If you</p> <p>8 were going to teach intelligent design, what things --</p> <p>9 now, for a moment keeping out whether it should be in</p> <p>10 a science class or someplace else. If you were going</p> <p>11 to teach intelligent design, what things would you as</p> <p>12 a teacher do?</p> <p>13 A Well, in fact, I do -- I don't teach</p> <p>14 intelligent design. I teach about intelligent design</p> <p>15 in my science classrooms at the collegiate level. I</p> <p>16 suppose I would do the same thing at -- and I think</p> <p>17 some students are ready for it even at the high school</p> <p>18 level -- is to examine the things I outlined in this</p> <p>19 presentation: What would motivate some people to be</p> <p>20 so energized and so enthusiastic about this idea of</p> <p>21 intelligent design in the first place? And I would</p> <p>22 bring in the -- the possible ways in which they have</p>
<p>242</p> <p>1 Q In a high school class on biology, for a</p> <p>2 teacher to teach biology, what would you expect that</p> <p>3 teacher to be doing?</p> <p>4 A Defining life as much as possible;</p> <p>5 delineating the life world from the physical world and</p> <p>6 from the social world, not separating them, but</p> <p>7 distinguishing them carefully; examining living beings</p> <p>8 at the level of both contemporary cross-section</p> <p>9 biochemically through molecular biology, but also --</p> <p>10 and this is something I strongly believe -- placing</p> <p>11 science in a narrative context.</p> <p>12 Telling stories is especially important at</p> <p>13 the level of high school education because humans are</p> <p>14 natively interested in good stories. So if you can</p> <p>15 present life as a story with a chapter by chapter sort</p> <p>16 of understanding, I think that would be very helpful.</p> <p>17 And that means, for me, evolution, which is a</p> <p>18 narrative way of organizing data, is indispensable to</p> <p>19 good biological teaching.</p> <p>20 Q By merely mentioning a particular topic such</p> <p>21 as in the -- in the policy that is read to the -- the</p> <p>22 policy statement read to the students where</p>	<p>244</p> <p>1 misread evolutionary biology to mean, perhaps,</p> <p>2 materialist atheism, and how the intelligent design</p> <p>3 people are not really reacting against a science but</p> <p>4 against a particular world view.</p> <p>5 Q So you would in teaching intelligent design</p> <p>6 talk about Dawkins and E.O. Wilson and others who</p> <p>7 have --</p> <p>8 A Oh, certainly.</p> <p>9 Q -- brought in a philosophical --</p> <p>10 A In fact that's what I do when I teach</p> <p>11 science and religion, yes. I make the students -- I</p> <p>12 want the students to be sensitive to the ideological</p> <p>13 components that tend to encumber and sometimes get</p> <p>14 conflated with scientific ideas, and I want that -- I</p> <p>15 want them to see it on both sides, both out of the</p> <p>16 intelligent design people and the scientific</p> <p>17 evolutionary materialist.</p> <p>18 Q Do you tell the students ahead of time that</p> <p>19 this is what you're going to -- this is what I'm going</p> <p>20 to be teaching you and this is what I'm going to</p> <p>21 expect you to learn?</p> <p>22 A No.</p>



DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

62 (Pages 245 to 248)

<p>245</p> <p>1 Q How do you –</p> <p>2 A I have them –</p> <p>3 Q – point to that?</p> <p>4 A Without commentary I have them read certain</p> <p>5 texts by Richard Dawkins and then texts by Michael</p> <p>6 Behe and William Dembs – William Dembski I haven't</p> <p>7 used in class, but Michael Behe and Phillip Johnson</p> <p>8 I've used. I have them read those texts without</p> <p>9 commentary and without preparation. And then in class</p> <p>10 we start discussing it, and hopefully the discussion</p> <p>11 itself will elicit a variety of interpretations. And</p> <p>12 occasionally you'll have – we have very bright</p> <p>13 students at Georgetown – you'll have students able to</p> <p>14 see immediately that the issue is not about science;</p> <p>15 it's about different belief systems.</p> <p>16 Q But when you – when you are, you know,</p> <p>17 teaching intelligent design in this classroom –</p> <p>18 A Teaching about it.</p> <p>19 Q – about it, are you expecting the student</p> <p>20 to take the same viewpoint that you hold?</p> <p>21 A No. In fact, I almost hope just for the</p> <p>22 sake of an interesting discussion that some of the</p>	<p>247</p> <p>1 them on their degree of acquaintance with the full</p> <p>2 spectrum of positions, and some students come out as</p> <p>3 materialists and some come out – very few – I can't</p> <p>4 even remember one who came out – well, maybe</p> <p>5 occasionally there's one or two who accepted</p> <p>6 intelligent design, but by far the majority of</p> <p>7 students I teach are able to make a distinction</p> <p>8 between science, the science of evolution, and the</p> <p>9 different philosophical interpretations of it.</p> <p>10 Q Is your course graded on the basis of a</p> <p>11 paper, or are the students graded by tests that they</p> <p>12 take?</p> <p>13 A Both. I give them blue book examinations,</p> <p>14 and then they have to do papers as well. The</p> <p>15 classroom discussion is graded, not on what they say</p> <p>16 but on their degree of participation.</p> <p>17 Q If you're teaching them about intelligent</p> <p>18 design, what kind of questions do you ask them in the</p> <p>19 tests?</p> <p>20 A "What is it that Michael Behe finds</p> <p>21 objectionable about Darwinian theory?"; that sort of</p> <p>22 question.</p>
<p>246</p> <p>1 students will be convinced by Behe's approach or</p> <p>2 Johnson's approach, but that then a kind of dialogue</p> <p>3 will take place within the classroom which will allow</p> <p>4 students eventually to see what's really going on</p> <p>5 here. But I don't – I try not to lead them.</p> <p>6 At the end of the particular section I'm</p> <p>7 dealing with, I do summarize the various positions. I</p> <p>8 have them use as a text my book on science and</p> <p>9 religion. If you've seen that text, you'll notice</p> <p>10 each chapter has four different spokespersons for four</p> <p>11 different positions on science and religion; the</p> <p>12 scientific materialists, those who see science and</p> <p>13 religion as separate worlds, those who see them as</p> <p>14 distinct but nonetheless capable of being related, and</p> <p>15 those who see religion as having a very subtle and</p> <p>16 passive role to play in the shaping of the kind of</p> <p>17 mind that would do science in the first place.</p> <p>18 Q After you get done with your dialogue with</p> <p>19 the class and there's a student that still does not</p> <p>20 accept the idea that intelligent design is not</p> <p>21 scientific, do you flunk that student?</p> <p>22 A Of course I – as I said earlier, I grade</p>	<p>248</p> <p>1 Q Do you find your class popular among the</p> <p>2 students?</p> <p>3 A Well, I've taught it for – I'm retired now,</p> <p>4 but until last year I taught it almost every semester</p> <p>5 for over 30 years, and it was always filled.</p> <p>6 Q The students that filled your classroom,</p> <p>7 were they students that were getting a degree in</p> <p>8 science of some kind or were they liberal arts</p> <p>9 students?</p> <p>10 A About 20 percent would be science students,</p> <p>11 25 percent maybe, and the others would be from all</p> <p>12 different disciplines.</p> <p>13 Q Have you ever read Douglas Futuyma's quote?</p> <p>14 A Evolution.</p> <p>15 Q Pardon me? Do you know the name Futuyma?</p> <p>16 A Futuyma, yeah.</p> <p>17 Q Yeah, F-U-T-U-Y-M-A-S. Quote, By coupling</p> <p>18 undirected purposeless variation to the blind,</p> <p>19 uncaring process of natural selection, Darwin made</p> <p>20 theological or spiritual explanations of the life</p> <p>21 processes superfluous, end of quote.</p> <p>22 A Yes, I've read that and many other similar</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

63 (Pages 249 to 252)

<p>249</p> <p>1 quotes by other biologists. Those are not scientific  2 statements. Those are purely biased philosophical  3 statements which should not be part of any science.  4 Q Who made this statement: Darwin made it  5 possible to become an intellectually fulfilled  6 atheist?  7 A Richard Dawkins with The Blind Watchmaker is  8 a perfect example of what I'm talking about.  9 Q Others of the prominent Darwinists include  10 Carl Sagan; is that correct?  11 A He was not technically a biologist, but he  12 would fit into the evolutionary materialist point of  13 view.  14 Q Going back to your -- your expert report.  15 Let me see if I can find it. Page 4, paragraph 2 --  16 MR. WILCOX: The parenthetical?  17 MR. THOMPSON: Yeah, the parenthetical,  18 but starting in the middle of that paragraph.  19 BY MR. THOMPSON:  20 Q Nor is it appropriate in the context of  21 public education that the ID proponents be permitted  22 to push their own implicitly theological agenda as the</p>	<p>251</p> <p>1 agenda as the only plausible religious alternative?  2 Do you see that written anywhere in the policy?  3 A It's not written formally, but it's implicit  4 when they recommend to students that they be exposed  5 to intelligent design as an alternative Darwinian  6 theory. What that, in effect, amounts to is their  7 exposure to a specific theological idea which I find  8 to be very narrow and which many other theologians  9 would find to be very narrow as well.  10 Q But it is not the -- nowhere do they say it  11 is the only plausible theory; would you agree with  12 that statement?  13 A Well, what I'm saying, in effect, is that  14 why aren't they talking about some Hindu conception of  15 deity; why this particular -- why intelligent design?  16 Why did they focus it on that? Why not recommend the  17 students read the Buddhist, Taoist, native American  18 texts? Why this particular specifically Christian  19 idea, an idea encumbered by a whole history of  20 Christian reflection? If it's from a point of view  21 of -- of broadening students' minds, they should not  22 talk just about intelligent design if they're going to</p>
<p>250</p> <p>1 only -- and you've got "only" italicized -- plausible  2 religious alternative, especially since other theists  3 find their theological assumptions to be deeply  4 flawed.  5 A Yes.  6 Q Where do you see in the policy that the  7 Dover School District pushes the ID as the only  8 plausible religious alternative?  9 MR. WILCOX: Objection.  10 THE WITNESS: What I'm saying there is  11 that, first of all, it's inappropriate to bring  12 implicitly theological agendas into the classroom in  13 the first place. But, secondly, that even the  14 specific kind of implicit theological agenda  15 represented by intelligent design assumes certain  16 characteristics of God that not every Christian  17 theologian or Islamic or Jewish theologian, but in my  18 cases especially Christian theologian, would associate  19 with ultimate reality.  20 BY MR. THOMPSON:  21 Q My question was, where in the policy do you  22 see that Dover is pushing an implicitly theological</p>	<p>252</p> <p>1 talk about other alternatives to -- to Darwinian  2 theory.  3 Q Let me make my question a little more  4 specific, then. Is there anywhere in the policy that  5 the Dover School District says that intelligent design  6 is the only plausible religious alternative?  7 A It's not said explicitly, no.  8 Q Okay.  9 MR. WILCOX: That's why he probably  10 said it's implicit.  11 THE WITNESS: It is.  12 MR. THOMPSON: Pardon me?  13 MR. WILCOX: Maybe that's why he used  14 the word implicit instead of explicit.  15 THE WITNESS: I used, it's an  16 implicitly theological agenda.  17 BY MR. THOMPSON:  18 Q And implicit is your own conclusion; is that  19 correct? When you say it's an implicit --  20 A Well --  21 Q -- theologic --  22 A -- it's my --</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

64 (Pages 253 to 256)

<p>253</p> <p>1 Q -- implicitly --</p> <p>2 A -- conclusion --</p> <p>3 Q -- theological agenda, it's a conclusion</p> <p>4 that you arrived at?</p> <p>5 A It's a conclusion that I have arrived at</p> <p>6 along with many other people.</p> <p>7 Q But reasonable people can differ about that</p> <p>8 conclusion, can they not?</p> <p>9 MR. WILCOX: Objection.</p> <p>10 THE WITNESS: I don't think reason, if</p> <p>11 reason was properly followed here, would allow that</p> <p>12 kind of wide open approach to this because my -- my</p> <p>13 whole approach is not just theological, but logical.</p> <p>14 Logically speaking, intelligent design</p> <p>15 discourse does not fall within the same framework of</p> <p>16 discussion that science and evolutionary biology</p> <p>17 participate in. It belongs to a separate realm; that</p> <p>18 of ideology rather than science. So it's unreasonable</p> <p>19 in my view.</p> <p>20 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>21 Q So no reasonable person can accept any other</p> <p>22 explanation of the policy that the Dover School</p>	<p>255</p> <p>1 Q First of all, you'll agree that no student</p> <p>2 was required to read Of Pandas and People; is that</p> <p>3 correct?</p> <p>4 A No, it was not required, but it was</p> <p>5 recommended.</p> <p>6 Q Do you see the word "recommended" anywhere</p> <p>7 in the policy?</p> <p>8 A In the statements that I read it seemed -- I</p> <p>9 don't know the exact words.</p> <p>10 Q Well, we have it right here in Exhibit 3.</p> <p>11 It says, The reference book Of Pandas and People is</p> <p>12 available for students who might be interested in</p> <p>13 gaining an understanding of what intelligent design</p> <p>14 actually involves. It doesn't -- that's the</p> <p>15 statement. Does that say recommend?</p> <p>16 A Yes, since it's the only text among many,</p> <p>17 many other books that students could be pointed to to</p> <p>18 expand their understanding of life. This is the one</p> <p>19 that this report mentions, so I take that to be an</p> <p>20 implicit recommendation.</p> <p>21 Q Another use of the word implicit?</p> <p>22 A Yes.</p>
<p>254</p> <p>1 District pushed ID as the only plausible religious</p> <p>2 alternative?</p> <p>3 MR. WILCOX: Objection.</p> <p>4 THE WITNESS: Could you rephrase the</p> <p>5 question?</p> <p>6 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>7 Q Rephrase it?</p> <p>8 A Uh-huh, more directly.</p> <p>9 Q I'm trying to respond to the comments that</p> <p>10 you made that it's not reasonable to make any other</p> <p>11 conclusion than that this is the only plausible</p> <p>12 religious alternative.</p> <p>13 A I didn't say that. What I was saying is</p> <p>14 that it's unreasonable to propose that a book that</p> <p>15 deals with intelligent design like Of Pandas and</p> <p>16 People can function as an alternative way of looking</p> <p>17 at life to the Darwinian approach because that's</p> <p>18 mixing apples and oranges. It's taking an approach</p> <p>19 which, as I've said all along, is implicitly</p> <p>20 theological and trying to juxtapose that as an</p> <p>21 alternative to a scientific mode of inquiry. That's</p> <p>22 the unreasonableness of it.</p>	<p>256</p> <p>1 Q And that's, again, your conclusion with</p> <p>2 which other people could differ; is that correct?</p> <p>3 A Other people --</p> <p>4 MR. WILCOX: Objection. This is so</p> <p>5 beyond the pale of discovery. All you're doing is</p> <p>6 arguing over different interpretations. It's obvious</p> <p>7 that they didn't say, there are lots of book in the</p> <p>8 library; go read some. They said, there is a book in</p> <p>9 the library, Of Pandas and People, that's available if</p> <p>10 you want to learn more about this subject. Now, if</p> <p>11 that's not a recommendation, I don't know what it is.</p> <p>12 So why don't you just move on to something else</p> <p>13 because we've only got an hour left.</p> <p>14 MR. THOMPSON: Okay. It's important</p> <p>15 because it deals with the policy, and, secondly, I'm</p> <p>16 questioning him on what he thinks is implicitly</p> <p>17 involved in the policy. He's using the words, and I'm</p> <p>18 trying to discover what he means by the words. I'm</p> <p>19 not trying to be --</p> <p>20 MR. WILCOX: His use of the word</p> <p>21 implicit was with reference to ID proponents. It</p> <p>22 wasn't in reference to the Dover Area School District.</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

65 (Pages 257 to 260)

<p>257</p> <p>1 He's not saying everybody on the school board is an ID          2 proponent, I don't think. If he means that, you can          3 ask him. Ask him what he means by that.          4 THE WITNESS: No, I don't mean that.          5 BY MR. THOMPSON:          6 Q We're talking about the policy. We're          7 talking about the policy. On page 6 again, at the          8 bottom of the second paragraph you say, For that          9 reason most scientists who believe in God reject the          10 proposition that ID is a scientific idea.          11 What is the basis for that statement? What          12 is your basis for that statement?          13 A I don't have a statistical basis. I'm only          14 speaking from my own contact in my work in science and          15 religion. Internationally I come into contact with          16 many, many scientists -- many scientists who believe          17 in God who are involved in science and religion          18 discussions, and almost to -- man or woman, they          19 reject the proposed -- the proposition that ID is a          20 scientific idea. I have encountered very, very few          21 people in the scientific community who are interested          22 in theology and who understand religion and are</p>	<p>259</p> <p>1 Q Hundreds?          2 A And I've addressed thousands, and in          3 question and answer sessions afterwards, that's when I          4 do a lot of my contact with these scientists. So they          5 hear me out, and if they thought that I was saying          6 something they didn't agree with, they would -- they          7 would tell me so. And my -- my sense is that          8 90 percent or more tend to like my approach to          9 evolution.          10 Q There are a lot of questions on that          11 statement that you made. How do you know all these          12 people believe in God unless you specifically ask          13 them?          14 A These -- these are people that are involved          15 in many, what are called, local society initiatives          16 that are sponsored by the John Templeton Foundation.          17 These are organizations all over the world which bring          18 together local science -- scientists to discuss issues          19 in religion, and I've addressed many of these groups.          20 I'm a member of the board of the Metanexus          21 Foundation, which is the foundation that disburses          22 funds to these local society initiatives all over the</p>
<p>258</p> <p>1 interested in religion who are advocates of this.          2 There are a small proportion of intelligent          3 design scientists that I come across occasionally, but          4 they're very, very much in the minority.          5 Q Well, how many scientists do you think there          6 are in the world?          7 A I have no idea.          8 Q Several hundred thousand?          9 A Well, more than that. There must be          10 millions.          11 Q Well, how many scientists have you come          12 across?          13 A I've come across a sampling that I think is          14 representative of many different scientists;          15 scientists from many different areas of the world,          16 many different areas of expertise. And I can say that          17 in the western world especially that almost all of          18 them would reject the idea that intelligent design is          19 a scientific idea.          20 Q Well, you say "a sampling." Can you give me          21 a number?          22 A Hundreds.</p>	<p>260</p> <p>1 world. So among people in the humanities, I've had          2 much more contact with a wide spectrum of scientists          3 than most people in my field especially.          4 Q Are you also a member of the -- on the board          5 of the Templeton --          6 A Yes, Templeton Foundation as well. I am at          7 the moment.          8 Q On page 6, the bottom of the page, last          9 paragraph -- let's see here. Yeah, the last          10 paragraph, it's paragraph four, it starts -- the          11 second sentence, quote, From the point of view of the          12 most prominent theologians, therefore, not only is ID          13 poor science, it is also appalling -- appalling --          14 it is --          15 A Appalling --          16 Q -- also --          17 A -- theology.          18 Q -- it is also appalling theology, period,          19 end quote.          20 Do you believe that?          21 A Yes. I didn't document -- this is not a          22 scholarly paper. I could have put a footnote after</p>



DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

66 (Pages 261 to 264)

<p style="text-align: right;">261</p> <p>1 every sentence in here. But if you want a list of          2 some of the most prominent theologians, I can name          3 people like Karl Barth, Paul Tillich, for example.          4 Paul Tillich has had an enormous influence          5 in the shaping of contemporary theology. He objects          6 to intelligent design because it brings in ultimate          7 reality as one cause among others in a whole series of          8 causes which is an implicit demotion of God.          9 The theologians that I'm referring to here,          10 Catholic and Protestant and Jewish, all consider          11 intelligent design, or in some cases natural theology          12 as a whole, to be an implicit trivialization of God          13 because it makes ultimate reality one cause, among          14 others, in a series of natural causes.          15 And this is how intelligent design argument          16 is implicitly -- again I say "implicitly" because          17 explicitly they deny that they're doing this. But          18 they're bringing in an ultimate level of explanation          19 at the level of -- in an explanatory slot where we          20 normally deal with physical causes. So God then          21 becomes one physical cause among others implicitly,          22 and that's a denial of divine transcendence, so that's</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">263</p> <p>1 Q Well, why would you introduce the theory of          2 intelligent design to your class if it's appalling          3 theology?          4 A I do this in all my -- in all my courses.          5 As I mentioned earlier -- we went over there several          6 times before -- I used to teach a course called The          7 Problem of God, and I introduced my students to          8 atheistic thought because I want them to be able to          9 deal with it, to critically examine it. If they never          10 come across these ideas within a context where they          11 can critically examine it, they will end up, as many          12 kids do, going out to graduate school or whatever          13 without sufficient preparation in terms of critical          14 awareness. So I want students -- I introduce them not          15 only to intelligent design, but I introduce them to          16 Dawkins to E.O. Wilson to Stephen J. Gould and others          17 who conflate ideology with science so they will be          18 able to critically distinguish science from ideology.          19 Q And the fact that it is appalling theology          20 is not relevant to the purpose for which you use          21 intelligent design; is that correct?          22 A In the classroom?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">262</p> <p>1 why I say it's theologically -- theologically it's          2 not -- it's appalling theology because it is an          3 attempt, in a sense, to bring the divine down to a          4 level of ordinary, mundane scientific inquiry.          5 Q But you'll agree with me that the ID          6 theorists don't view the theory of ID as theology?          7 A Formally speaking they deny that it is, but          8 once again, as we've said many, many times, it          9 functions religiously and theologically in the three          10 senses of the term religion that I mentioned earlier.          11 Q As do many Darwinian theorists; is that          12 correct?          13 A The Darwinian theorists function as          14 religious in the first sense of the term not in the          15 second and third.          16 Q But you didn't distinguish --          17 A Many Darwinians, not all by any means -- for          18 example, Ken Miller is an exception. But many          19 Darwinians I have agreed do tend to implicitly make          20 Darwin -- Darwinian explanation ultimate explanation,          21 and that's wrong. That's religiously inappropriate,          22 scientifically inappropriate.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">264</p> <p>1 Q Right.          2 A No, it's not relevant at all, but it is one          3 prominent, publicly known position which is the duty          4 of educators to allow their students to -- to come          5 into contact with so that they can be critically --          6 able to examine it critically.          7 Q You will agree that the teachers -- the          8 biology teachers in Dover do not, in fact, teach          9 intelligent design?          10 A I don't -- I don't know that that's          11 universally the case.          12 Q If all that is being read is that statement          13 and nothing further, that is not teaching intelligent          14 design, is it?          15 A In itself, correct.          16 Q Okay. Can you answer that yes or no?          17 A Yes.          18 Q It is not teaching intelligent design; is          19 that correct?          20 MR. WILCOX: Objection, that's a double          21 negative question. It's bound to be confusing.          22 MR. THOMPSON: Okay.</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

67 (Pages 265 to 268)

<p>265</p> <p>1 THE WITNESS: Yeah, it's confusing.</p> <p>2 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>3 Q I don't want to confuse you. I don't want</p> <p>4 to confuse myself either. The fact that intelligent</p> <p>5 design is merely mentioned in this four-paragraph</p> <p>6 statement that is read does not amount to teaching</p> <p>7 intelligent design, does it?</p> <p>8 A Not directly, but indirectly it could</p> <p>9 lead -- it's tendentious, let's say; it could lead</p> <p>10 toward a teacher -- I could see how a teacher who is</p> <p>11 personally predisposed toward intelligent design would</p> <p>12 take this statement as legitimization of teaching</p> <p>13 intelligent design in the classroom. I could see that</p> <p>14 happen quite easily.</p> <p>15 Q Does that fall within your definition of</p> <p>16 teaching you gave me a while back?</p> <p>17 MR. WILCOX: Which is "that"?</p> <p>18 MR. THOMPSON: It was a long discussion</p> <p>19 of what teaching is --</p> <p>20 THE WITNESS: Yes.</p> <p>21 MR. THOMPSON: -- and I don't want to</p> <p>22 go through it, but we can if you want.</p>	<p>267</p> <p>1 believe?</p> <p>2 A Depth is one metaphor that we use among many</p> <p>3 other metaphors available in reference to ultimate</p> <p>4 reality.</p> <p>5 Q Is there a -- can you give me a description</p> <p>6 of what you mean by God is depth?</p> <p>7 A I start with -- basing my thought here on</p> <p>8 theologian Paul Tillich, and he points out that in our</p> <p>9 experience of reality, there are four different areas</p> <p>10 that we all encounter. We encounter other people; we</p> <p>11 encounter ourselves; we encounter nature; and we</p> <p>12 encounter history and society.</p> <p>13 And to take the first, in our relationship</p> <p>14 to another person we think we get -- we know that</p> <p>15 person, but then this person will do something or say</p> <p>16 something that surprises us or disappoints us, so if</p> <p>17 we're to continue with our relationship with that</p> <p>18 person, we have to dig to a deeper level. And we</p> <p>19 think we know that person at that level, but once</p> <p>20 again experience will show us that we do not.</p> <p>21 To make a long story short, the reason that</p> <p>22 we never reach rock bottom in our understanding of the</p>
<p>266</p> <p>1 THE WITNESS: My definition of teaching</p> <p>2 applies in different ways to different fields of</p> <p>3 study. In all fields of study the objective is to get</p> <p>4 the student to come into contact with the human desire</p> <p>5 to know, but as I also mentioned earlier, the desire</p> <p>6 to know requires different methods in different</p> <p>7 fields, and I would not want to confuse a science</p> <p>8 class that's dealing with evolution by proposing that</p> <p>9 they should look at -- or that they -- I would not</p> <p>10 even mention Of Pandas and People in a science class</p> <p>11 because it would give students the impression that</p> <p>12 maybe this is an alternative to what they're learning</p> <p>13 in biology.</p> <p>14 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>15 Q Well, my question is, merely mentioning the</p> <p>16 phrase intelligent design, do you consider that</p> <p>17 teaching intelligent design?</p> <p>18 A Strictly speaking, no.</p> <p>19 Q I must say I was very interested in your</p> <p>20 definition of God in your book, Deeper Than Darwin,</p> <p>21 but I don't understand it. I want to ask you some</p> <p>22 questions about that. You define God as depth, I</p>	<p>268</p> <p>1 other person is that that person has an inexhaustible</p> <p>2 dimension, depth. The same is true of nature. The</p> <p>3 same is true of history. The same is true of our own</p> <p>4 selves. That, in other words, there's an</p> <p>5 incomprehensible mystery. Depth is just another word</p> <p>6 for mystery.</p> <p>7 If you correlate it with the definitions I</p> <p>8 gave -- three definitions, it would fit in the second</p> <p>9 definition. So an awareness of the infinite and</p> <p>10 inexhaustible depth of nature is one of the ways in</p> <p>11 which I would try to give a person some sense of what</p> <p>12 I mean by God. It fulfills the definition of God as</p> <p>13 transcendent. It's not identical with nature,</p> <p>14 history, us; it transcends us. Just instead of</p> <p>15 thinking of God as up there as classical thought is</p> <p>16 done -- as prescientific thought is done, after depth</p> <p>17 psychology came along, a new horizon opened up to us,</p> <p>18 that of the dimension of depth.</p> <p>19 And that is just one of many ways in which</p> <p>20 we can begin to find something in our experience off</p> <p>21 of which we can bounce the word God so as to make some</p> <p>22 sense of it. It's by no means an exhaustive</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

68 (Pages 269 to 272)

<p style="text-align: right;">269</p> <p>1 understanding.</p> <p>2 Q Your definition of God also, in a sense,</p> <p>3 removes him from direct causation of life on earth; is</p> <p>4 that correct?</p> <p>5 A To make God a direct cause of anything is to</p> <p>6 demote God. God is the ground of all causes, not --</p> <p>7 not so much a specific physical cause but the ground</p> <p>8 or the foundation of all causation.</p> <p>9 Q So you would answer my question yes?</p> <p>10 A Yes.</p> <p>11 Q Okay. So even though the creed says, maker</p> <p>12 of heaven and earth --</p> <p>13 A Uh-huh.</p> <p>14 Q -- you do not consider him maker of heaven</p> <p>15 and earth as we would understand that?</p> <p>16 MR. WILCOX: Objection.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: The expression heaven and</p> <p>18 earth refers to what is visible and invisible, and</p> <p>19 what it means is that wherever there is being --</p> <p>20 wherever there are beings, there's a ground of being,</p> <p>21 and that's what we mean by creator.</p> <p>22 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">271</p> <p>1 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>2 Q -- in common terminology.</p> <p>3 A Well, it's a term that in theology we have</p> <p>4 to be very careful with. What it means theologically</p> <p>5 is that whatever exists has an ultimate cause or an</p> <p>6 ultimate explanation.</p> <p>7 Q Well, was there a man on earth referred to</p> <p>8 in Genesis as Adam? Do you believe that?</p> <p>9 A If you want me to give a full answer to this</p> <p>10 question, I have to give you a little bit of</p> <p>11 introduction to biblical literature. And the answer</p> <p>12 to it is that Adam in the theological community today</p> <p>13 is understood as a -- not an actual organic individual</p> <p>14 but as the term itself means in Hebrew. It means</p> <p>15 mankind. It has a kind of generic quality to it.</p> <p>16 So I believe that God creates everything,</p> <p>17 not just Adam, but everything. But God creates not in</p> <p>18 the same way that scientific causes operate, but in a</p> <p>19 much deeper way.</p> <p>20 Q Well, am I correct in understanding, then,</p> <p>21 that even though the Bible says -- refers to Adam as a</p> <p>22 single man, you refer to him as mankind?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">270</p> <p>1 Q This ground of being, I guess that's</p> <p>2 another --</p> <p>3 A That's a theological expression of Paul</p> <p>4 Tillich.</p> <p>5 Q But the creed talks about maker of heaven</p> <p>6 and earth, and then the second line is of all</p> <p>7 visible -- things visible and invisible.</p> <p>8 A Yeah.</p> <p>9 Q Are those different categories?</p> <p>10 A No, I think they're two ways of saying that</p> <p>11 whatever exists -- they're just two different ways of</p> <p>12 saying that whatever exists has a foundation; that is</p> <p>13 not part of the created world but which is the</p> <p>14 foundation of the created world.</p> <p>15 Q Did God make Adam?</p> <p>16 A Who is Adam? What do you mean by "Adam"?</p> <p>17 Q In the Book of Genesis.</p> <p>18 A What do you mean by "make"?</p> <p>19 Q Did God create Adam, the first man?</p> <p>20 A What do you mean by "create"?</p> <p>21 Q Whatever that definition normally means --</p> <p>22 MR. WILCOX: Objection.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">272</p> <p>1 A What the Bible is trying to do in that -- by</p> <p>2 asking that question that you just asked, you -- you</p> <p>3 assume that I'm following a literalist interpretation</p> <p>4 of the Book of Genesis, which I do not as I've been</p> <p>5 saying all day.</p> <p>6 The Book of Genesis has a deep meaning, but</p> <p>7 the deep meaning is not to be arrived at by taking the</p> <p>8 individual characters in the story as representative</p> <p>9 of factual, actual human beings. The story is trying</p> <p>10 to get across the importance of hope for people, and</p> <p>11 what it's trying to say is that in spite of evil and</p> <p>12 in spite of the mess we get ourselves in, there is a</p> <p>13 reality which is sufficiently resourceful, God; that</p> <p>14 by being able to bring a whole universe into existence</p> <p>15 can also bring our own lives to fulfillment as well in</p> <p>16 spite of all evil.</p> <p>17 Q Well, maybe to make it more specific without</p> <p>18 referring to the Bible since you are Roman Catholic,</p> <p>19 let's talk about the magisterium of the church, what</p> <p>20 the Roman Catholic church believes. The Roman</p> <p>21 Catholic church believes that Adam is a word for -- a</p> <p>22 generic word for humankind, or does the church believe</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005.

69 (Pages 273 to 276)

<p style="text-align: right;">273</p> <p>1 that there was a man -- the first man created by God?</p> <p>2 A Here, again, you have to be careful to</p> <p>3 define what you mean by "church." In the teaching of</p> <p>4 the Second Vatican Council, the "church" means the</p> <p>5 whole people of God, not just the magisterium. And</p> <p>6 the magisterium is not just ecclesial docents, ecclesia</p> <p>7 teaching, works of the church teaching, but it's also</p> <p>8 the church learning as well. This is a theology that</p> <p>9 has emerged most explicitly in the Second Vatican</p> <p>10 Council.</p> <p>11 And when the magisterium -- if you identify</p> <p>12 the Pope as magisterial -- speaks, the Pope, like</p> <p>13 everybody else, learns. And what the past pope, Pope</p> <p>14 John Paul II, learned over the course of his lifetime</p> <p>15 was that evolution is a fairly probable hypothesis,</p> <p>16 and that's why he wrote a statement showing that the</p> <p>17 Catholic church is not opposed to evolutionary</p> <p>18 thinking. The only thing that it's opposed to is the</p> <p>19 identification of evolution as materialism, and that's</p> <p>20 what I've been bringing out today.</p> <p>21 So the church has no formal statement ever</p> <p>22 that I know of that Adam was a factual historical</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">273</p> <p>1 was a woman named Eve?</p> <p>2 A The Eve that I accept is our ancestor in</p> <p>3 Africa that the scientists talk about. But, no,</p> <p>4 that's all part of a way of trying to get across a</p> <p>5 deep religious truth which we miss altogether if we</p> <p>6 interpret it literally.</p> <p>7 Q Well, do you believe in the original sin?</p> <p>8 A I believe that the Doctrine of Original Sin</p> <p>9 can make sense -- very good theological sense if we</p> <p>10 don't interpret it as something that's inherited</p> <p>11 genetically from one generation to the next, but</p> <p>12 instead understand it as applying to the fact that the</p> <p>13 world into which each one of us is born has been</p> <p>14 messed up in some ways by the accumulation of bad</p> <p>15 human decisions.</p> <p>16 All of us are contaminated by evil social</p> <p>17 structures, for example, unjust social structures.</p> <p>18 Look at the poverty in Africa and elsewhere that's due</p> <p>19 to the maldistribution of the world's wealth. The sin</p> <p>20 of injustice is something that has an effect on</p> <p>21 everybody born into this world.</p> <p>22 That's original sin, and it's much more</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">274</p> <p>1 being.</p> <p>2 Q Well, I mentioned the magisterium and you</p> <p>3 responded by the magisterium. What about the</p> <p>4 catechism of the Catholic church?</p> <p>5 A The Catholic catechism is outinformed and</p> <p>6 it's out of touch with what's going on in science when</p> <p>7 it speaks of Adam almost as a historical person.</p> <p>8 There's been a lot of discussion in the theological</p> <p>9 community about the thorough and complete inadequacy</p> <p>10 of the Catholic catechism, of the people who wrote the</p> <p>11 Catholic catechism were not informed about science and</p> <p>12 evolution, and that's one of the things that happens</p> <p>13 when people do not become informed about science.</p> <p>14 Q Would you then agree that at least the</p> <p>15 catechism refers to Adam as a man created by God?</p> <p>16 A Yes, and I thoroughly disagree with that</p> <p>17 approach. And one can be a good Catholic and dissent</p> <p>18 from specific formulations like that, and even the</p> <p>19 papal statements themselves, I think, implicitly rebut</p> <p>20 that particular formulation. This is not an</p> <p>21 infallible document.</p> <p>22 Q What about Eve; do you believe that there</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">276</p> <p>1 serious and much more in need of redemption than</p> <p>2 something that's inherited biologically.</p> <p>3 Q Do you believe in the Catholic Doctrine of</p> <p>4 Original Sin as a result of decisions made by Adam and</p> <p>5 Eve?</p> <p>6 A Again, you're asking this question in the</p> <p>7 form of a biblical literalist.</p> <p>8 Q I'm talking about, again, the catechism of</p> <p>9 the church, the magisterium or the catechism of the</p> <p>10 church.</p> <p>11 MR. WILCOX: Objection, compound.</p> <p>12 THE WITNESS: You're trying to force me</p> <p>13 to play a literalist creationist sort of game which I</p> <p>14 have all day been distancing myself from, and I've</p> <p>15 been doing that because of theological convictions and</p> <p>16 religious convictions that we trivialize biblical text</p> <p>17 if we ask questions the way that you just did.</p> <p>18 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>19 Q Did you answer my question?</p> <p>20 A It's not a meaningful question.</p> <p>21 Q So you refuse to answer it?</p> <p>22 A If I said yes or no to a question like that,</p>



DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

70 (Pages 277 to 280)

<p style="text-align: right;">277</p> <p>1 it would — it would implicitly be making me a part of          2 a kind of literalist way of looking at religious text.          3 So I could say in a figurative way, and in preaching,          4 for example — I'm not a preacher, but if I were a          5 preacher, I could use terms like the fact we are all          6 descendents of Adam, for example, to figuratively          7 represent the fact that we're all in need of          8 redemption. That's the whole point of the story.          9 The point of the story is not to make people          10 literalists but to make people aware of their need for          11 redemption.          12 Q Isn't it true, however, that the magisterium          13 and the catechism of the church hold that Adam was, in          14 fact, a unique individual created by God and that Eve          15 was, in fact, a unique individual created by God;          16 doesn't the church hold that as a part of its          17 magisterium and catechism?          18 A It depends on what you mean by "magisterium"          19 here. If you mean the teaching of the deepest truths          20 that have been bequeathed to us by scripture and          21 tradition, the magisterium would not require that I          22 say literally that Adam and Eve existed, and I don't</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">279</p> <p>1 whole story of the virgin birth, if you read          2 contemporary biblical scholarship, is trying to make a          3 theological point that this is a special person.          4 The Christians were not the first to talk          5 about virgin birth. You find in interreligious          6 literature parallel types of stories in which          7 prominent individuals were brought about in a very          8 exceptional manner. And the purpose of this kind of          9 language, if you look at it historically in the          10 context in which it arose, was to give people a sense          11 of the specialness of Christ.          12 Q Trying to interpret what you just said,          13 then, what you are saying is that the virgin birth was          14 not, in fact, a historical fact?          15 A It's not a verifiable — even in principle          16 it's not a verifiable biological fact.          17 I could say the same thing of the          18 resurrection. The resurrection is not a          19 scientifically knowable reality.          20 Q Well, see, I'm not talking about scientific          21 now. I'm talking about your — you're a Catholic          22 theologian, and I'm talking about what you as a</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">278</p> <p>1 know of any competent theologian who would go along          2 with that.          3 Q What about the same question relating to the          4 catechism of the church?          5 A Catechism of the church is a conditioned —          6 a historically conditioned document which changes.          7 There have been many catechisms over the course of          8 times. Some catechisms, like the Baltimore catechism,          9 express things one way. The reason that we come up          10 with new catechisms is people recognize the inadequacy          11 of earlier ones. That's the only reason why the new          12 catechisms are brought about.          13 Already there are a lot of people such as          14 myself who say we can do a lot better in presenting          15 Christian doctrine than this carelessly constructed          16 catechism. Not all parts are carelessly constructed,          17 but some of them are.          18 Q Do you believe in the virgin birth of          19 Christ?          20 A I believe it in this sense; that what the          21 virgin birth literature is trying to get across is not          22 a biological fact but it's trying to bring out — the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">280</p> <p>1 theologian believe.          2 A All right. If you'll concede that, that          3 we're not talking about scientifically factual here,          4 then the interpretation that I gave is in conformity          5 with that requirement that you just laid down. I'm          6 giving you an interpretation and understanding of the          7 virgin birth which does not require that we trivialize          8 it by making it some sort of scientific curiosity but          9 that we look for the religious intention of the          10 authors who were talking about this event, and that          11 religious intention was to uphold — to find one of          12 many, many different ways in which the New Testament          13 tries to bring out the preeminence of Christ.          14 Q Again, keeping in mind, now, we're talking          15 about what you believe as a theologian, I'm going to          16 ask you the question again. Do you believe in the          17 virgin birth as an actual fact of history?          18 A That's an irrelevant thing. That's an          19 irrelevant question. Do I believe in — you don't —          20 you don't believe in facts. Facts are things which          21 are — which are — things that are publicly knowable.          22 The whole of the New Testament is in a genre</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

71 (Pages 281 to 284)

<p>281</p> <p>1 of literature in which one has to undergo what I</p> <p>2 earlier referred to as a personal transformation in</p> <p>3 order to understand what's going on in the text. So</p> <p>4 that to ask the question do I believe in the virgin</p> <p>5 birth as a fact is, in a sense, to miss the whole</p> <p>6 point of the doctrine of -- or the biblical idea of a</p> <p>7 virgin birth. And that point is to draw attention not</p> <p>8 to this woman and not to some biological curiosity,</p> <p>9 but to the preeminence of this man.</p> <p>10 Q Well, the only reason I ask that question is</p> <p>11 because the catechism of the church speaks about it.</p> <p>12 A You have to understand here that --</p> <p>13 MR. WILCOX: That's not a question.</p> <p>14 THE WITNESS: Okay.</p> <p>15 MR. WILCOX: If he wants to ask a</p> <p>16 question, I assume he's getting to one.</p> <p>17 MR. THOMPSON: Yeah. Thank you.</p> <p>18 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>19 Q So I'm asking you specifically, is that a</p> <p>20 historical fact? Regardless of whether it's trivial</p> <p>21 or irrelevant in your mind, is that a historical fact?</p> <p>22 A What do you mean by "historical"?</p>	<p>283</p> <p>1 of Hypostatic Union, perhaps, the union of the God,</p> <p>2 the nature of the God and the nature of human in</p> <p>3 Christ, yes.</p> <p>4 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>5 Q Well, do you believe that Christ is God --</p> <p>6 A As I said --</p> <p>7 Q -- incarnate?</p> <p>8 A As I said earlier, I can recite the Nicene</p> <p>9 Creed with complete genuineness and honesty, but you</p> <p>10 have to remember that as a theologian I have been</p> <p>11 trained to see things in this creed that perhaps a</p> <p>12 literalist mentality would not. So the questions that</p> <p>13 you're asking me right now are questions that really</p> <p>14 are not able to elicit, even in principle, what I</p> <p>15 really believe because you're trying to force me into</p> <p>16 a kind of literalist response -- yes or no response to</p> <p>17 the type of questions that you're asking.</p> <p>18 Q Well, those are the, you know, same kind of</p> <p>19 responses (sic) that priests ask children as they go</p> <p>20 through confirmation.</p> <p>21 A But in that context -- that's a religious</p> <p>22 context. It's not an intellectual context. When I go</p>
<p>282</p> <p>1 Q That it occurred in history, in time.</p> <p>2 A That it occurred in what sense? Physically?</p> <p>3 Q Yes.</p> <p>4 A In a way that could be in principle verified</p> <p>5 by biological testing?</p> <p>6 Q I would say so.</p> <p>7 A No. And for me to say yes to a question</p> <p>8 like that is, in a sense, to place me in the camp of</p> <p>9 literalist religiosity which all day I have been</p> <p>10 distancing myself from.</p> <p>11 Q Do you believe that Christ was the son of</p> <p>12 God?</p> <p>13 A Yes, provided you understand what "son of</p> <p>14 God" means.</p> <p>15 Q I'm using that term as a Catholic would use</p> <p>16 that term.</p> <p>17 MR. WILCOX: Objection.</p> <p>18 THE WITNESS: The term son of God, if</p> <p>19 you know the biblical literature, is one that's</p> <p>20 employed in other ways than -- and applied to other</p> <p>21 individuals in biblical history in the Old Testament.</p> <p>22 So what you're asking is do I believe in the Doctrine</p>	<p>284</p> <p>1 to church, and I go to mass faithfully every Sunday,</p> <p>2 and recite the creed, what I'm thinking when I recite</p> <p>3 this creed is not the same thing that a seventh grader</p> <p>4 or third grader is thinking.</p> <p>5 Q What about the Catholic catechism; is it the</p> <p>6 same as the Catholic catechism is depicting and</p> <p>7 describing?</p> <p>8 A Again, there are different levels of</p> <p>9 adequacy with which one even reads the catechism. The</p> <p>10 catechism is not the best way to introduce people to</p> <p>11 religion. But if you're talking about catechisms,</p> <p>12 they have -- the different formulas in the catechism</p> <p>13 can be read at many different levels of theological</p> <p>14 development.</p> <p>15 Q Do you think truth changes for the church?</p> <p>16 MR. WILCOX: Objection.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: Again, you're using</p> <p>18 "truth" in a way that I wouldn't use it. Truth as</p> <p>19 the -- truth is the objective of the human desire to</p> <p>20 know, and it's not something that could ever be</p> <p>21 sequestered and confined by the human mind. It's a</p> <p>22 goal that we're on our way toward our whole lives. Do</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

72 (Pages 285 to 288)

<p style="text-align: right;">285</p> <p>1 I believe that there is something there that is          2 calling me to be honest, to be truthful? Yes.          3 BY MR. THOMPSON:          4 Q Do you believe that God came into this world          5 through Christ?          6 A Yes. I also believe that God has been          7 coming into this world in other ways as well.          8 Q Do you believe that God came into this world          9 as Christ for a specific purpose, that being the          10 salvation of men's souls?          11 A That's one way of putting it, but eastern          12 Christianity would not put it that way so much as to          13 say that God comes into the world to divinize the          14 world.          15 Q To what?          16 A Divinize it, to make the world -- to          17 transform the universe.          18 Q So that God is not someone who stays outside          19 of nature?          20 A Right. God, as I've been saying all along,          21 is deeply involved in nature but not in the same way          22 that the scientific cause is involved, more deeply</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">287</p> <p>1 a pre-scientific people fundamental religious truth          2 that there is something deeply liberating at the          3 ultimate levels of reality.          4 Q Am I to then conclude by that statement that          5 there was no such thing as the parting of the Red Sea          6 as it was described in the Bible?          7 A As you see it in Cecil B. DeMille's Ten          8 Commandments, no. There was not -- if you were there          9 with the eyes of a naturalist, all you would see is          10 people struggling through what was called the Yom Suf.          11 It wasn't even the Red Sea. It was the Sea of Reeds.          12 Most scholars now deny that it had anything to do with          13 the Red Sea at all. And you would not have seen walls          14 of water like that. You would have seen -- if you          15 were there with the eyes of a scientist or with a          16 camera, that's what you would have seen.          17 What religion does is look for the deeper          18 meanings of such events, and the Hebrews concluded          19 that on the basis of that experience that we can posit          20 the existence of an ultimate reality, which is not          21 only liberating of the world, but eventually they          22 developed a Doctrine of Creation out of that; that</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">286</p> <p>1 than that.          2 Q Well, he -- he actually came down and lived          3 on earth; correct?          4 A I believe in the Incarnation, but to put it          5 in the formula that you just did is only the -- a very          6 pre-philosophical, pre-theological way of getting at          7 the truth of the Doctrine of the Incarnation.          8 Q Do you believe in miracles?          9 A I believe that there are things that happen          10 in nature which do not violate scientific laws, laws          11 of physics and chemistry, but which can be interpreted          12 by the religious mind as evidence of the presence of          13 the divine.          14 Q Do you believe the biblical account of the          15 parting of the Red Sea?          16 A That's a stylized legendary way of getting          17 across the truth that God is ultimately a liberating          18 reality that seeks to set us free, including free from          19 religious prejudices.          20 Q What does "stylized" mean? What do you mean          21 by "stylized"?          22 A It's the specific style of getting across to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">288</p> <p>1 this liberator is also a creator.          2 So Genesis, in fact -- the stories in          3 Genesis are much later than the Exodus stories in          4 their theological reflections that unfold as the          5 religious thinkers think about things that unfold, the          6 deeper meanings. This is why the notion of death is          7 very important to me.          8 Q Do you believe that Christ was crucified,          9 died and was buried as a historical fact?          10 A Yes, but I would like to know what all of          11 this has to do with this particular case?          12 Q Because it's -- I'm testing your credibility          13 as a Catholic theologian.          14 A But I would like to know what -- what gives          15 you the authority to be able to decide what is or what          16 is not a Catholic theologian --          17 Q I'm not making that -- I'm not making that          18 assumption.          19 A Well, to be able to think you can raise the          20 relevant questions that can decide that issue.          21 Q Because you're here as a theologian and          22 you've been discussing all of intelligent design as a</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

73 (Pages 289 to 292)

<p>289</p> <p>1 religious doctrine --</p> <p>2 A I'm here --</p> <p>3 Q -- and you've defined religion for me, and</p> <p>4 you've written a book, which we've been discussing,</p> <p>5 Deeper Than Darwin, where you actually had been making</p> <p>6 those kinds of comments.</p> <p>7 A Well, if you read the books, you will see</p> <p>8 that the kinds of questions that you've been asking me</p> <p>9 are not appropriate to the kind of theology that I do.</p> <p>10 Q Nevertheless, we'll continue on here. Do</p> <p>11 you believe that Christ was crucified, died and was</p> <p>12 buried as a historical fact?</p> <p>13 A Of course.</p> <p>14 Q Okay. Do you believe that he was</p> <p>15 resurrected from the dead as a historical fact?</p> <p>16 A What do you mean by "historical fact"?</p> <p>17 Q That it happened.</p> <p>18 A Well, if you put things in that way, yes,</p> <p>19 Jesus is alive. Resurrection, you know, is only one</p> <p>20 of the ways in which the New Testament tries to</p> <p>21 represent -- the fundamental fact for the Christian is</p> <p>22 that Jesus lives. The way in which that was expressed</p>	<p>291</p> <p>1 A Right.</p> <p>2 Q -- after Jesus was resurrected --</p> <p>3 A Yes.</p> <p>4 Q -- taking photos of that room</p> <p>5 continuously --</p> <p>6 A Right.</p> <p>7 Q -- there would not have been a Christ?</p> <p>8 A That's my opinion, and it's an opinion that</p> <p>9 I share with some other theologians as well.</p> <p>10 Q Do you believe that the Bible is the</p> <p>11 inspired word of God?</p> <p>12 A Yes.</p> <p>13 Q Okay. Do you believe in the Holy Trinity?</p> <p>14 A Of course.</p> <p>15 Q Okay. So you believe in the existence of</p> <p>16 God the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit?</p> <p>17 A As I said all along I can recite the Nicene</p> <p>18 Creed, the Apostle's Creed with complete honesty and</p> <p>19 fullness in faith.</p> <p>20 Q There was a question I wanted to ask you,</p> <p>21 and then I forgot, the -- Christ came to this world</p> <p>22 for the specific purpose of dying for our sins; isn't</p>
<p>290</p> <p>1 in the New Testament is through resurrection stories,</p> <p>2 but it was also expressed through the stories about</p> <p>3 the coming of the spirit of Christ upon the Disciples</p> <p>4 who were galvanized by their common experience of this</p> <p>5 man during his lifetime to the belief that this man's</p> <p>6 substantiality was so solid that death could not</p> <p>7 defeat it, and that, therefore, he lives. And</p> <p>8 resurrection is one way of representing that.</p> <p>9 But, again, if there was a camera and</p> <p>10 scientific experts in the upper room, that the</p> <p>11 evangelists talk about, when Jesus appeared, they</p> <p>12 would not have seen him.</p> <p>13 Avery Dulles, for example, who is a rather</p> <p>14 conservative theologian and now a Cardinal of the</p> <p>15 Roman Catholic church -- you might want to read his</p> <p>16 book Apologetics of the Biblical Christ. He said this</p> <p>17 in this books many, many years ago, that without</p> <p>18 faith, nobody would have seen the risen Christ,</p> <p>19 including the early Disciples.</p> <p>20 Q So what you're saying, if I gather</p> <p>21 correctly, is that if we had a camera going in the</p> <p>22 upper room --</p>	<p>292</p> <p>1 that true?</p> <p>2 A That's one interpretation.</p> <p>3 Q Well, isn't that the interpretation that the</p> <p>4 Catholic church gives?</p> <p>5 A Yes, and I can accept that, but that does</p> <p>6 not exhaust the meaning of Christ. That's what I'm</p> <p>7 saying. Christ also came to bring this universe to</p> <p>8 fulfillment, this evolving universe.</p> <p>9 Q True. But the fact is that he came here for</p> <p>10 the purpose of --</p> <p>11 A That's part of the creed. I can accept</p> <p>12 that.</p> <p>13 Q Okay. We've had a long, long, long day, and</p> <p>14 I appreciate your patience.</p> <p>15 MR. THOMPSON: And the patience of you,</p> <p>16 Counselor.</p> <p>17 BY MR. THOMPSON:</p> <p>18 Q Is there anything now that you think back --</p> <p>19 is there anything that you want to add or subtract --</p> <p>20 A No.</p> <p>21 Q -- from your testimony?</p> <p>22 A No.</p>



DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

74 (Pages 293 to 296)

<div style="text-align: right;">293</div> <p>1 MR. THOMPSON: Okay. That will be it.</p> <p>2 Thank you.</p> <p>3 THE WITNESS: Thank you.</p> <p>4</p> <p>5</p> <p>6 (Signature not having been waived, the</p> <p>7 deposition of JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D., was concluded</p> <p>8 at 4:45 p.m.)</p> <p>9</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p>	<div style="text-align: right;">295</div> <p>1 CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER-NOTARY PUBLIC</p> <p>2 I, Dana R. Craddock, Registered</p> <p>3 Professional Reporter, the officer before whom the</p> <p>4 foregoing deposition was taken, do hereby certify that</p> <p>5 the foregoing transcript is a true and correct record</p> <p>6 of the testimony given; that said testimony was taken</p> <p>7 by me stenographically and thereafter reduced to</p> <p>8 typewriting under my direction and that I am neither</p> <p>9 counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the</p> <p>10 parties to this case and have no interest, financial</p> <p>11 or otherwise, in its outcome.</p> <p>12 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my</p> <p>13 hand and affixed my notarial seal this 13th day of</p> <p>14 June, 2005.</p> <p>15 My Commission Expires:</p> <p>16 June 30, 2005</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20 NOTARY PUBLIC IN AND FOR</p> <p>21 THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA</p> <p>22</p>
<div style="text-align: right;">294</div> <p>1 ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF DEPONENT</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 I, JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D., do hereby</p> <p>4 acknowledge that I have read and examined the</p> <p>5 foregoing pages of testimony, and the same is a true,</p> <p>6 correct and complete transcription of the testimony</p> <p>7 given by me, and any corrections appear on the</p> <p>8 attached Errata sheet signed by me.</p> <p>9</p> <p>10</p> <p>11 (DATE) (SIGNATURE)</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p>	<div style="text-align: right;">296</div> <p>1 ERRATA SHEET</p> <p>2 IN RE: TAMMY KITZMILLER, et al vs DOVER AREA</p> <p>3 SCHOOL DISTRICT AND DOVER AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD</p> <p>4 OF DIRECTORS</p> <p>5 RETURN BY: _____</p> <p>6</p> <p>7 PAGE LINE CORRECTION AND REASON</p> <p>8</p> <p>9</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22 (DATE) (SIGNATURE)</p>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

75 (Page 297)

<p>1           ERRATA SHEET</p> <p>2    IN RE: TAMMY KITZMILLER, et al. vs. DOVER AREA</p> <p>3    SCHOOL DISTRICT AND DOVER AREA SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD</p> <p>4    OF DIRECTORS</p> <p>5    RETURN BY: _____</p> <p>6    _____</p> <p>7    PAGE LINE    CORRECTION AND REASON</p> <p>8    _____</p> <p>9    _____</p> <p>10    _____</p> <p>11    _____</p> <p>12    _____</p> <p>13    _____</p> <p>14    _____</p> <p>15    _____</p> <p>16    _____</p> <p>17    _____</p> <p>18    _____</p> <p>19    _____</p> <p>20    _____</p> <p>21    _____</p> <p>22    (DATE)                      (SIGNATURE)</p>		

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

298

<b>A</b>	137:2,21	281:11 284:5	112:19,20	52:9 74:1
<b>abbreviated</b>	138:13,20	284:11 288:5	<b>according</b> 126:5	122:20 131:7
208:9	140:6 141:21	290:2,11	145:19 148:4	139:3 145:14
<b>ability</b> 7:6	143:16 145:5	<b>above</b> 83:22	148:22 158:19	146:9 159:16
241:12	147:10 149:1	140:4 202:20	<b>account</b> 56:13	167:12 176:20
<b>able</b> 7:10 46:7	152:3 153:3	<b>absent</b> 46:6	117:21 230:14	185:11 187:17
51:8,20 127:11	154:10,10,18	65:18	286:14	230:18 255:14
136:17 151:11	155:3 158:14	<b>absolute</b> 104:3	<b>accounts</b> 127:8	286:2 289:5
161:15 167:4	160:19 161:22	<b>absolutely</b> 65:18	190:8	<b>ad</b> 213:7,11
169:8 199:7	162:4 163:9,13	106:5 139:8	<b>accumulation</b>	<b>Adam</b> 270:15,16
227:3,5 231:4	163:14 164:20	147:9 235:18	275:14	270:16,19
241:10 245:13	165:10 167:7	<b>absolutism</b>	<b>accurate</b> 10:4	271:8,12,17,21
247:7 263:8,18	169:6 170:7,8	67:13	15:6 29:3 30:6	272:21 273:22
264:6 272:14	173:10 174:6	<b>abstract</b> 24:16	48:13 99:18	274:7,15 276:4
283:14 288:15	176:8,16 177:8	161:7,11	134:20 149:19	277:6,13,22
288:19	178:17 180:12	<b>abstracts</b> 74:1	207:21 208:21	<b>adaptable</b> 93:3
<b>about</b> 14:21	180:14,21	177:10	<b>accusation</b>	<b>adaptive</b> 51:7,9
17:14 19:6,7	181:10 182:17	<b>abundant</b> 149:1	157:11	51:21 83:6
23:18 26:8,13	183:9 184:9	<b>academic</b> 37:3	<b>achieve</b> 189:1	152:8
28:21 29:2,6	185:10 195:3,7	72:9 123:20	<b>achieved</b> 83:2	<b>add</b> 141:12
30:8,9 31:1	197:18 200:7	182:21 183:8	<b>acknowledge</b>	143:15 178:10
34:4,17 41:11	206:5,22	<b>Academy</b> 40:22	166:5 294:4	292:19
45:16 46:21	209:21 215:9	234:9 236:20	<b>ACKNOWLEDGE...</b>	<b>added</b> 144:21
47:1,5 51:13	216:10 217:9	236:22	294:1	184:6
51:14 55:17	219:18 222:16	<b>accept</b> 69:19	<b>ACLU</b> 13:18	<b>adding</b> 143:18
57:6,7,8 61:4	222:19 223:17	107:8,10	<b>acquaintance</b>	<b>addressed</b> 63:11
61:14,15 62:10	224:3,6 225:3	141:10,16	247:1	259:2,19
65:18 66:20	227:7,7 231:22	147:8,9,10	<b>across</b> 110:5	<b>addressing</b>
68:15 70:17	233:7,10 240:7	160:4 177:19	133:13 153:18	158:20
72:9 73:2,3,20	241:16 243:14	184:13 229:9	165:5 258:3,12	<b>adequacy</b> 81:7
74:4 75:2 76:6	243:20 244:6	235:13 246:20	258:13 263:10	210:12,13,14
83:10 96:13	245:14,15,18	253:21 275:2	272:10 275:4	284:9
97:16,22 98:6	245:19 247:17	292:5,11	278:21 286:17	<b>adequate</b> 29:4
99:14 101:8	247:21 248:10	<b>acceptable</b>	286:22	29:11,21 30:7
105:20 106:3	249:8 251:14	187:2 234:7	<b>action</b> 139:13	70:6 151:4
107:18 108:15	251:22 252:1	235:15	165:1	210:21
113:18 115:19	253:7 256:10	<b>accepted</b> 69:20	<b>activities</b> 56:17	<b>adequately</b>
116:5,7,10	257:6,7 266:22	136:4,11	<b>actual</b> 6:17	45:18 113:17
117:16,18	270:5 272:19	160:15,17	39:20 104:22	142:12 210:19
122:22 123:2	274:3,9,11,13	199:15 209:4	110:7 145:15	<b>adheres</b> 140:18
124:6,8 125:7	274:22 275:3	232:18 247:5	214:15 224:21	<b>admit</b> 168:1
125:8 127:19	276:8 278:3,12	<b>accepts</b> 199:22	271:13 272:9	212:4 236:9
128:18 129:19	279:5,7,20,21	<b>accidents</b> 68:21	280:17	<b>admitting</b>
133:1 135:19	279:22 280:3	69:2,3,8 70:9	<b>actually</b> 17:13	129:16
136:14,21	280:10,15	<b>accomplish</b>	19:16 33:9	<b>adopted</b> 202:22

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

299

adult 80:7	67:12 77:11	96:14 120:22	107:14 130:5	190:5,14,14,16
advanced 178:1	102:6 103:12	123:15 125:11	133:11 141:13	205:22 207:11
advancing	110:1 114:11	126:7,10 141:6	168:17 171:10	250:2,8 251:1
123:22	129:11 130:10	141:19 143:12	171:11 204:1	251:5 252:6
advice 14:3	133:22 143:21	143:19 144:11	206:14 246:3	254:2,12,16,21
advisement	152:13 179:5	144:13 146:14	253:11 264:4	266:12
22:11	184:17 200:18	146:21,22	allowed 20:13	alternatives
advocate 44:4	205:11 214:12	147:22 148:11	61:17 82:16	14:16,17,18
132:11 212:9	214:22 216:21	149:7 151:2	204:22	186:12,12,13
advocates 53:13	218:2,18 220:8	158:12,13	allowing 155:7	186:13 252:1
53:14 65:21	256:1 257:7	170:16 176:9	allows 49:14	although 16:19
66:9 123:13	261:16 262:8	178:5 191:17	156:9,10	67:10 103:16
135:9,13	267:20 273:2	192:12 193:13	all-knowing	144:19 145:8
149:15,20	276:6,8 280:14	202:9 207:18	70:6,8	147:9 179:20
209:17 211:2	280:16 284:8	210:18,18	almost 17:19	197:17 199:6
258:1	284:17 290:9	212:8,19 214:2	119:6 132:6	altogether 275:5
advocating	against 8:8	233:3,4 234:15	148:13 163:9	always 16:3
212:12	13:17,18 14:3	251:11 255:1	170:19 177:18	55:14 85:4
affect 53:18	19:11 125:15	259:6 262:5	179:16 212:4	89:6 91:9,21
119:1,2 121:10	141:14 142:10	264:7 274:14	227:21 229:4	112:15 116:19
212:11 230:2	157:11 190:1,3	agreed 210:9	241:12 245:21	128:10 129:20
affirm 156:9	211:12 233:5	262:19	248:4 257:18	167:2 175:12
affirmation	233:17 234:13	agreeing 14:20	258:17 274:7	215:21 217:10
154:18	235:6 244:3,4	agreement 2:10	alone 66:12	230:5,5,8
affirmatively	age 133:4	Aguillard 36:6,7	190:6	248:5
135:17	agency 162:5,11	36:9	along 21:11,12	America 41:1
affixed 295:13	agenda 217:22	Ah 127:1	39:5 44:17	American 40:22
afraid 231:19	218:3,4,5	ahead 21:7 30:5	85:4 133:7	202:6 251:17
Africa 275:3,18	249:22 250:14	63:12 75:12	176:7 185:16	amiable 42:22
after 15:2 16:19	251:1 252:16	118:6 152:12	201:14 229:1	among 164:19
17:4,6,7 21:3	253:3	172:17 199:19	237:10 253:6	237:4 240:11
23:2 38:4,11	agendas 250:12	244:18	254:19 268:17	248:1 255:16
43:19,20 45:5	agent 169:4	all 4 24:12	278:1 285:20	260:1 261:7,13
48:11 57:19	175:10	296:2 297:2	291:17	261:21 267:2
71:8 83:13	ages 10:17 70:14	Albert 49:8	already 26:16	amount 30:15
100:18 131:21	115:17	232:11	31:21 205:12	30:18 265:6
158:1 200:17	agnostic 53:14	Alfred 3:4 18:18	230:14 237:14	amounts 251:6
215:11 239:8	237:1	41:15 118:18	278:13	analogous 47:6
239:16 246:18	ago 15:21 26:8	alive 289:19	alter 140:15	analogy 22:10
260:22 268:16	43:5 104:14	alleged 73:5	altered 145:14	51:17 80:2
291:2	105:10 106:11	allegedly 50:2	alternative 14:5	114:11
afterglow 231:2	113:11 152:1	106:22 107:2	16:7 50:1,2,3,8	analysis 211:4
afterwards 43:7	204:8 290:17	allegorically	93:8 186:4,19	213:1
259:3	agree 14:7 57:16	164:13	187:10,11,12	analytical 52:17
again 52:8 60:19	65:2 89:6	allow 62:13	187:13 188:4	ancestor 94:22



DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

300

95:3,5 147:5 275:2 ancestors 94:16 Andre 227:19 and/or 173:7 animal 94:21 102:4 animals 147:6 222:20 Ann 3:17 another 19:13 19:16 66:18,21 73:7 82:12 86:1 88:4 108:22 123:4 128:18 133:18 147:8 152:9 166:22 190:15 210:15 238:19 255:21 267:14 268:5 270:2 answer 6:18,20 7:11,13 8:1 30:5 32:9,10 33:22 52:20 66:17 84:8 87:9,21 91:1,8 92:9,14 95:16 97:5 178:6 201:7 227:3,6 259:3 264:16 269:9 271:9,11 276:19,21 answering 7:3 152:11 answers 6:13,14 193:17 antecedent 114:3 Anthony 135:19 137:14,21 anti-Darwinian 209:20 anti-intelligent 123:12	anybody 67:20 157:15 219:7,7 223:8 233:22 anymore 113:6 114:17 anyone 8:14 9:1 9:7 36:21 173:5 anything 58:5 74:4 122:4 158:3 165:13 236:3,9 269:5 287:12 292:18 292:19 anyway 7:1 231:15 anywhere 179:14 251:2 252:4 255:6 apart 23:20 46:13 211:11 217:21 233:18 235:7 Apologetics 290:16 apologize 127:9 193:18 Apostle's 291:18 appalling 260:13,15,18 262:2 263:2,19 appallingly 238:21 260:13 apparently 92:1 100:21 appeal 58:21 77:5,10 78:11 78:12 115:10 120:15 122:15 137:11 154:4 163:4 177:1 179:14 181:8 195:12 237:19 appealed 179:20 179:22	appealing 78:8 98:3 180:2 218:22 appeals 46:9 137:9 139:16 219:4 221:1 appear 104:9 294:7 appearance 65:6,10 appeared 101:6 102:4 290:11 apples 192:19 254:18 application 61:9 applied 143:6,9 144:1 216:11 282:20 applies 42:19 56:11 108:7,9 266:2 apply 111:14 applying 275:12 appreciate 292:14 apprenticed 110:21 240:19 apprised 107:17 approach 17:15 18:5,21 19:21 20:1 26:17 44:13,16 73:22 74:3 93:17 110:20 116:8 120:15 131:12 150:11 191:2 240:6 246:1,2 253:12,13 254:17,18 259:8 274:17 approaches 16:7 17:16 204:13 205:1 appropriate 49:12,22 67:1	82:13 100:10 181:18 184:22 206:19 249:20 289:9 appropriaten... 189:9 approximate 129:18 approximately 174:10 approximation 129:19,20 April 38:4 231:8 apt 22:11 Aquinas 68:22 115:18 180:5,5 219:1,14 221:16 229:21 arbitrary 56:3 113:20 Arbor 3:17 Arch 3:7 area 1:7,8 4:11 13:15 24:12,13 29:20 34:16 35:2 72:4 180:1 186:14 221:8 233:12 256:22 296:2,3 297:2,3 areas 258:15,16 267:9 argue 214:8 argues 151:20 arguing 256:6 argument 46:9 48:18 213:7 214:13 219:1 233:5,17 235:6 261:15 argumentation 57:17 argumentative 120:7 arguments	209:6 arise 96:11 arises 216:3 aristotelian 61:12 105:14 111:19 aristotelianism 116:3 Aristotle 99:12 99:13,18 100:6 116:4,10 138:13,20 180:5 221:16 228:9 Aristotle's 221:11 Arkansas 35:21 36:2 Arlington 11:7 arose 279:10 around 78:9 97:7,8 109:9 arrive 74:8 arrived 253:4,5 272:7 art 239:22 article 16:9,21 44:14 109:2 articles 15:4 73:5 articulate 71:12 articulated 218:6 artificial 219:11 arts 248:8 asceticism 111:1 111:9 ascribe 173:16 Asian 20:17 asides 53:1 223:7 asked 13:11 22:4 28:14,14 29:19 70:11 74:12 127:19
---	---	---	--	---

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

301

182:2 193:11 226:19 272:2 asking 28:15 38:17 54:15 193:16 272:2 276:6 281:19 282:22 283:13 283:17 289:8 asks 166:6 aspect 44:8 150:8 170:17 aspects 53:21 73:21 108:19 145:18 216:22 218:18 224:14 224:22 assessing 212:16 214:2 assessment 189:2 211:7 assignments 241:19 assist 36:21 associate 168:4 250:18 associated 174:5 assume 7:14 81:4 124:11 234:14 272:3 281:16 assumed 78:5 assumes 250:15 assuming 32:13 53:17 assumption 14:1 66:16 73:15,19 79:14,16,18 288:18 assumptions 50:17 61:17 67:13 250:3 astronomical 171:18 astrophysical 174:16 188:18	astrophysically 154:16 astrophysics 97:21 atheism 212:5,6 244:2 atheist 135:20 135:21 200:22 215:6 249:6 atheistic 48:15 62:12 201:13 237:5,11,19,20 237:21 263:8 atheists 49:7 135:12 237:1 athletically 112:19 atom 229:5 232:7 atoms 185:22 attached 9:15 24:4 32:21 294:8 attack 119:10 120:1,2,5 123:13 attacked 119:15 120:6 122:2 attacking 121:19,20 122:6 215:15 attempt 45:17 124:12,13 174:10 184:2 213:12 218:10 262:3 attempted 89:17 222:8 attempts 55:7 71:21 93:3 attended 193:14 attending 193:5 attention 31:11 140:21 149:17 281:7	attorney 24:19 attract 166:22 attribute 160:8 August 12:5 author 20:20 229:12 authored 17:7 19:17 authority 61:12 111:12 179:15 180:1 288:15 authors 19:10 280:10 automatically 111:10 automobile 93:2 available 33:12 113:13 187:15 188:2 255:12 256:9 267:3 avenues 239:18 Avery 290:13 avoid 166:15 aware 19:3,4 24:21 27:5 94:1 110:16 130:21 197:14 197:17 239:16 277:10 awareness 89:11 263:14 268:9 away 214:5 a.m 1:16 45:4,5 100:17,18  B B 4:7 216:16,16 287:7 baboons 95:2 back 16:4 18:2,6 18:13,17 22:20 23:18 44:19 48:11 52:8 68:22 86:9 100:20 130:18	145:7 147:6 153:9 154:5 159:3 167:13 167:17 170:17 175:4 198:22 225:2 229:1,3 230:4 249:14 265:16 292:18 background 30:15 231:2 Bacon 62:3 116:6 bacterial 46:21 47:1 62:20 64:17 82:6,22 83:4,17 84:5 85:1,7 86:4 105:5 106:8,18 195:8 bad 125:17 275:14 balance 66:20 66:21 89:18 190:12,19,22 balanced 14:15 189:18,21 190:1,3,9,11 Baltimore 278:8 Banezians 70:15 Bang 225:10,13 226:4,5,8,10 226:15,18 227:3,16,20 229:7,12 230:1 230:15 231:3 231:16,22 232:8 235:22 Barbara 26:19 38:2 123:17 Barbour 18:8 Barth 261:3 base 159:20 based 41:17 43:9,12 85:10 123:14 211:17	214:14,15 236:6 bases 30:9,10 basic 23:10 73:21 199:22 basically 5:22 43:21 108:13 138:6 164:1 200:19,22 205:19 213:7 basing 216:21 267:7 basis 6:10,18 42:2 44:6,7 51:16 66:1 90:11,15 104:18 134:3 161:5 169:11 176:18 178:4 203:16 206:3 218:8,20 247:10 257:11 257:12,13 287:19 became 15:7 19:3,4 become 15:11 23:16 48:17 96:12 110:20 140:8 174:13 197:7 204:15 207:19 239:16 249:5 274:13 becomes 54:1 195:12 214:10 235:5 261:21 before 2:10 5:9 9:8 11:11,16 12:15,16 15:9 15:11 17:3,9 17:22 116:1,6 155:9,9 170:21 182:14,15 183:3 199:1 202:15 209:14
--	---	---	--	--

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

302

210:9 212:8	being 22:14	139:14 140:2	284:10	226:5,8,10,15
223:6 224:15	34:20,21 35:14	140:17 150:10	better 169:15	226:17 227:2
230:20 235:4	39:21 74:6	150:13 156:10	278:14	227:15,20
263:6 295:3	76:2 101:9	167:11,15	between 37:17	229:6,12 230:1
began 62:2 91:6	104:11 119:15	170:6 171:14	45:1 50:15	230:15 231:2
96:13 232:7	120:3,4,6	176:21 177:20	53:12 70:14,19	231:16,22
begin 183:4	139:3 160:20	183:6 185:6	77:21 87:22	232:8 235:22
268:20	169:7 171:16	193:19 196:17	88:2 91:17	Bill 22:5 42:13
beginning 69:6	173:11 175:8	196:22 200:12	130:19 132:2	42:21 43:1
104:3 112:7	178:1 179:22	205:9 220:18	151:12 152:14	59:5 78:19
115:12 118:14	189:9 190:1,3	228:17 236:3	155:18 158:4	89:16 169:6,12
133:15 140:20	191:14 194:16	242:10 257:9	165:21 166:8	billion 91:22
153:8,16	214:13 215:2	257:16 259:12	185:4 192:16	93:15 94:13
189:10 198:21	232:1,18 236:2	260:20 267:1	199:8 200:12	103:20 104:14
199:1 202:17	238:15,16	271:8,16	200:15 204:13	133:9 171:16
202:18 218:9	246:14 264:12	272:22 274:22	205:1,3,14,15	billions 140:14
227:16 228:1,4	269:19,20	275:7,8 276:3	206:15 215:1	biochemical
228:6	270:1 272:14	278:18,20	225:7 239:20	45:19 97:17
begins 180:13	274:1 285:9	280:1,15,16,19	247:8	biochemically
begs 163:6	beings 152:8	280:20 281:4	beyond 71:22	96:19 242:9
BEHALF 3:3,12	242:7 269:20	282:11,22	72:22 91:14	biochemist 47:3
Behe 23:4 39:21	272:9	283:5,15 285:1	117:11 256:5	47:4
42:10 43:12	Belgian 229:12	285:4,6,8	be-all 209:6	biochemistry
45:1,8,20 59:6	232:1	286:4,8,9,14	bias 124:12	97:18 127:7
62:19 76:7,12	belief 59:21,22	288:8 289:11	216:14 232:12	220:22
82:6,16 84:21	59:22 60:2,2	289:14 291:10	biased 249:2	biogeographical
85:18 88:1,2,3	65:4 67:19	291:13,15	Bible 83:14	90:7
106:21 107:21	76:14 82:2	believed 228:5	132:10 137:13	biography
149:16,22	108:22 109:22	228:11	140:1 158:2	125:17
150:1 158:19	110:3 157:22	believes 76:7	180:19 271:21	biological 46:20
161:20 168:21	175:18 200:15	157:15 272:20	272:1,18 287:6	47:11 51:3
180:10 181:11	237:12,14	272:21	291:10	79:1 104:4
191:18 195:3	245:15 290:5	belong 41:5	biblical 132:12	132:21 136:1
208:22 214:8	beliefs 50:17	54:12 68:2	132:17,18	144:17 190:13
220:18 245:6,7	156:3,5,6	138:3	134:18,19	209:21 242:19
247:20	189:19 191:7	belongs 73:7	155:8 156:20	278:22 279:16
Behe's 46:13	218:8	105:18 186:8	160:10 219:10	281:8 282:5
106:7 142:16	believe 13:1	253:17	271:11 276:7	biologically
146:2 150:11	16:18 18:12	bequeathed	276:16 279:2	276:2
208:17 210:9	58:20,21 64:13	277:20	281:6 282:19	biologist 43:13
246:1	81:8 107:1	Bergson 118:18	282:21 286:14	47:2 127:16
behind 67:15	126:13,14,20	Berlinski	290:16	177:13 197:21
76:16 125:20	129:11 133:1,3	135:14	big 70:13 75:2,4	238:17 249:11
125:20 213:22	133:5,19,21	Bernard 118:18	75:10 159:5,5	biologists 79:11
226:10,15	135:13 139:8	best 6:6 40:18	225:9,13 226:4	99:6 103:13,13

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

303

106:20 107:17	blue 247:13	139:7 169:21	106:9,15	building 104:20
129:5 157:9	board 1:9 4:11	170:1,5 187:15	breaks 7:1	buried 288:9
168:8,22	13:19 14:9,12	195:3 217:16	182:10	289:12
170:19 237:4	24:13 33:5	217:17 222:15	briefly 45:17	business 59:3
238:1 249:1	35:2 195:20	236:19 246:8	bright 245:12	64:10 82:5
biology 4:12	196:4,5,8,17	247:13 254:14	bring 28:11 50:1	B-A-R-B-O-U...
14:5,17,18	197:8 233:12	255:11 256:7,8	54:17,19,20	18:9
23:20 33:6	257:1 259:20	266:20 270:17	57:22 63:9	
35:13,14 39:8	260:4 296:3	272:4,6 289:4	67:1 74:9	C
43:14 50:3	297:3	290:16	75:14 77:16	C3:1 4:1 5:1
68:4 86:3 96:8	boards 192:4,5	books 10:5 15:2	81:19 86:19	171:3
105:22 106:14	197:1	18:1 19:14,16	87:8 105:14	call 16:3 24:14
106:15,17	board's 14:3	22:20 23:12,12	137:2 171:12	56:6 57:19
107:14 125:14	191:7 203:1	41:20,21 43:18	221:9 227:12	58:11 69:8
157:1,12	bodies 166:21	67:11 73:5	239:13 243:22	72:1 78:9 92:2
170:18 182:4	body 143:6,9	225:19 255:17	250:11 259:17	102:6 105:8
182:15 183:3,4	144:2 240:17	289:7 290:17	262:3 272:14	109:20 111:18
188:4 189:10	boiling 97:3,4,6	book-length	272:15 278:22	115:2 117:22
196:20 197:16	97:10,11 98:13	28:1,2	280:13 292:7	118:3,22 119:5
198:7,21 199:9	126:2,3 178:9	born 10:8,18	bringing 65:18	119:7 140:19
203:10 207:19	187:4	216:19 275:13	98:17,19	145:19 231:5
222:13,16,19	bones 91:22	275:21	120:10 128:5	232:8 233:8,9
224:11 225:3	book 15:4 16:9	both 11:1,8,9	218:18 221:10	239:13
233:9 238:6	16:19,21,22	19:7 27:6 38:4	261:18 273:20	called 18:2,2,9
242:1,2,9	17:4,5,22 18:2	223:20 240:21	brings 154:5	18:19 21:9
244:1 253:16	18:7,8,14,18	242:8 244:15	261:6	27:17 38:21
264:8 266:13	19:1,5,13,16	244:15 247:13	broad 141:8	76:3 109:6
birth 278:18,21	20:20,22 21:8	bottled 102:11	157:16 185:14	110:21 114:17
279:1,5,13	21:11,15,17,18	bottom 182:19	broadening	114:18,19
280:7,17 281:5	21:21 22:5	257:8 260:8	251:21	131:2 146:8
281:7	23:8 27:17,19	267:22	broader 28:5,19	152:21 153:2
Bishop 11:6	31:14,15,16	bounce 268:21	59:14	157:15 164:8
bit 23:7 101:16	41:18,19 43:17	bound 173:9	broadly 218:7	169:22 170:6
229:2 271:10	45:7,9,10,12	264:21	brought 31:10	206:1 232:7
Black 45:8	45:14,15 46:9	Box 3:16 45:8	58:18 81:15	259:15 263:6
48:12 181:11	46:9 47:15,15	48:12 181:12	153:6 212:16	287:10
204:16	48:11 52:9	204:16	244:9 278:12	calling 18:6
blanket 202:14	53:20 54:3,11	bracketed 123:1	279:7	231:8 285:2
blind 51:13	54:12 66:8	brain 94:15	Buddhist	calls 29:13 47:9
137:2 165:14	68:4 71:8	brains 236:6	251:17	132:7 169:16
248:18 249:7	79:21 80:9,20	break 6:21,22	budding 147:19	210:16
blocks 104:20	80:21,22	7:2,4 100:16	buffoon 229:14	Cambrian 91:17
blood 195:8	108:12,17	106:5 131:18	232:10	93:10 100:20
blood-clotting	117:9 127:4	182:11	build 134:10	101:8 102:4
47:18	134:3,10,15	breakdown	135:1,3	103:7,9,11,15



DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

304

103:17,21	13:13,15,16,18	causation 99:8	51:4 55:3 58:3	changes 23:11
104:3,5	13:21 14:3	269:3,8	58:12,20 68:11	23:14 278:6
came 17:4 36:4	25:1,8,19	cause 100:7,7,9	80:20,22 84:16	284:15
51:17 61:8	27:15 29:7,12	100:10 106:14	88:9 89:4 93:5	changing
83:5,10 96:17	34:18,22 35:7	138:9,13,21,22	110:19 111:1,3	146:19 230:17
97:16,22 98:6	36:1,2,6,12,15	162:5,10 175:3	111:3,12,14	channels 57:21
108:14 119:10	57:6 58:10	207:12 221:10	119:6 122:6	chapter 17:5
153:9 154:6,18	124:2,3 132:22	221:11,15	129:2,9 147:10	21:16 23:2
229:17 247:4	151:1 159:2	261:7,13,21	173:3 174:2	44:2 242:15,15
268:17 285:4,8	191:22 202:20	269:5,7 271:5	179:15 213:4	246:10
286:2 291:21	209:7 264:11	285:22	216:12 227:18	chapters 15:4
292:7,9	288:11 295:10	caused 65:12,13	236:12 237:20	198:2,9,10,13
camera 287:16	cases 107:1	71:5 76:1	245:4 250:15	character 56:9
290:9,21	250:18 261:11	85:12 86:6	certainly 59:20	107:19 127:16
camp 44:13	casts 100:21	87:17	64:13 89:22	170:15 177:8
133:17 150:15	catalyst 19:6	causes 55:8	90:21 150:10	characteristic
151:18 282:8	catechism 274:4	78:14 85:21	211:21 223:22	46:4 59:17
camps 150:15	274:5,10,11,15	99:14,17,19	225:13 234:21	70:5 81:16
150:21	276:8,9 277:13	100:9 111:19	236:3 244:8	150:11 160:13
Camus 49:8	277:17 278:4,5	172:3 176:6	CERTIFICA...	166:21 168:2
capable 122:8	278:8,16	220:15 221:9	295:1	173:16 178:21
246:14	281:11 284:5,6	221:12 261:8	certify 295:4	217:13 226:22
capacity 174:3	284:9,10,12	261:14,20	cetera 222:8	characteristics
capped 102:11	catechisms	269:6 271:18	chair 12:14 36:5	58:1 78:3
capricious	278:7,8,10,12	cautious 136:7	challenge 64:2	152:7 160:9
219:11	284:11	Cecil 287:7	104:6	161:17 162:1
Cardinal 290:14	categories 222:6	cell 223:18	chance 18:3	163:10 174:2,4
career 10:5	270:9	cells 174:12	44:2 68:6	250:16
38:19 39:3,4	category 48:7	cellular 63:2	137:1 169:19	characterize
121:18,19	58:16 190:18	center 3:14	171:20	131:3 181:5
208:1	Catholic 11:8,9	16:22 41:2	change 22:21	characterized
careful 23:6	19:17,22 41:1	116:12	23:1 44:3	181:6
202:13 271:4	82:16 140:2	centuries 16:4	113:3 114:12	characters
273:2	148:18 180:8	118:8 216:20	114:13 115:6,9	149:4 272:8
carefully 14:11	180:10 229:17	219:19	140:5 145:12	Chardin 19:18
53:20 227:18	261:10 272:18	century 55:21	145:13 148:5,6	19:19 20:2,6,7
239:20 242:7	272:20,21	58:10 64:4	148:13 149:1	23:19 118:18
carelessly	273:17 274:4,5	69:1 71:5	153:10 155:1	Charles 46:10
278:15,16	274:10,11,17	112:8 115:13	158:10,10,14	cheating 239:10
Carl 249:10	276:3 279:21	115:15 116:2	158:20 173:21	239:11
carried 171:11	282:15 284:5,6	117:5 153:9,17	210:6	check 170:11
carry 97:7	288:13,16	213:4 219:16	changed 114:20	cheese 235:12
195:19	290:15 292:4	219:17,17	115:11 144:12	235:14
case 1:5 5:9 8:5	causality 105:15	228:5	144:14,16	cheese-like
8:12 12:22	139:15	certain 45:19	154:21 155:2,5	226:22

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

305

<b>cheese-type</b> 231:5	195:8	<b>classroom</b> 60:4	<b>come</b> 14:19	147:3,4 149:21
<b>chemical</b> 174:15	<b>circuitous</b> 163:6	66:20 68:3	55:12 76:6	150:2 209:13
188:17	<b>cites</b> 145:20	187:21 200:9	85:10 89:4	210:3,5 271:2
<b>chemically</b> 154:15	146:2	214:9 245:17	94:21,22 106:3	290:4
<b>chemistry</b> 39:15	<b>citizen</b> 202:6	246:3 247:15	111:10 112:13	<b>commonality</b> 165:20 166:8
39:21 75:9	<b>civics</b> 207:4	248:6 250:12	113:18 156:15	<b>commonly</b> 146:8
286:11	<b>civil</b> 13:18 45:2	263:22 265:13	166:18 167:3	<b>communicate</b> 241:12
<b>chemists</b> 237:6	45:3	<b>classrooms</b>	176:20 180:6	<b>communities</b> 111:13
<b>Chicago</b> 36:3	<b>claim</b> 65:16	14:13 67:2	181:17 220:12	<b>community</b> 63:9
<b>child</b> 80:6	147:2,8 148:3	243:15	232:4 237:12	64:3,7 66:10
<b>children</b> 10:15	148:4,11,21,21	<b>clearly</b> 37:16	247:2,3 257:15	67:8 90:16
10:16 283:19	149:9,17,18	61:18 209:5	258:3,11,13	111:11,16,17
<b>chimpanzees</b> 95:1	168:21 172:7,7	<b>clergy</b> 119:18	263:10 264:4	112:10 113:2
<b>Christ</b> 278:19	172:9,12	<b>close</b> 55:22	266:4 278:9	118:7 119:7
279:11 280:13	220:14	120:19 137:8	<b>comes</b> 40:3	121:17 136:9
282:11 283:3,5	<b>claimed</b> 146:8	137:15 207:14	62:18 84:4	190:11 194:16
285:5,9 288:8	<b>claims</b> 143:7,10	237:2	97:3 110:4	209:4 216:7,11
289:11 290:3	144:2 146:7,10	<b>closely</b> 223:15	125:18 142:14	217:13 234:16
290:16,18	146:16 147:13	<b>closer</b> 137:22	149:1 160:12	235:1,5,11
291:7,21 292:6	209:10 220:16	<b>closure</b> 227:12	162:17 171:17	257:21 271:12
292:7	<b>clarification</b>	<b>clotting</b> 195:8	209:21 285:13	274:9
<b>Christian</b> 140:2	77:3 101:13	<b>coat</b> 111:5	<b>comfortable</b> 144:7,8	<b>community's</b> 111:22
202:7 250:16	166:6 204:9	<b>COBE</b> 230:20	<b>coming</b> 82:7	<b>compact</b> 229:3,3
250:18 251:18	<b>clarifies</b> 184:20	230:22 231:11	118:12 141:14	<b>comparable</b> 99:3
251:20 278:15	<b>clarify</b> 39:16	<b>code</b> 171:3	148:18 180:22	<b>comparative</b> 90:6 202:1
289:21	<b>clashes</b> 200:19	176:10,21	230:13 285:7	<b>comparatively</b> 93:3 94:17
<b>Christianity</b> 137:13 285:12	<b>class</b> 38:16	178:1	290:3	<b>compared</b> 120:4
<b>Christians</b> 156:12 279:4	49:21,21 54:12	<b>coefficient</b> 124:9	<b>Commandme...</b> 88:21 287:8	<b>comparing</b> 50:22 192:18
<b>church</b> 20:12	54:16 188:22	212:15	<b>comment</b> 220:8	<b>comparison</b> 120:9
61:12 83:17	189:11 201:20	<b>cognitive</b>	<b>commentary</b> 245:4,9	<b>compatibility</b> 155:12,17
180:8 272:19	202:2 203:10	61:19 122:13	<b>comments</b> 199:12 254:9	<b>compel</b> 203:2
272:20,21,22	204:17,18,19	<b>cognitively</b>	289:6	<b>compensation</b> 34:8,10
273:3,4,7,8,17	206:7,9,20	112:21	<b>Commission</b> 295:15	<b>complete</b> 86:1
273:21 274:4	207:1,3,4,5,19	<b>coherence</b> 128:5	<b>commit</b> 122:9	
276:9,10	208:3 225:3,4	<b>collapse</b> 187:8	<b>committed</b> 86:22	
277:13,16	242:1 243:10	<b>collecting</b> 91:21	<b>common</b> 5:22	
278:4,5 281:11	245:7,9 246:19	<b>collection</b> 17:3	89:8 94:22	
284:1,15	248:1 263:2	179:16	95:2,5 104:6	
290:15 292:4	266:8,10	<b>collegiate</b> 225:4	112:14 133:9	
<b>cilium</b> 64:18	<b>classes</b> 17:14,17	243:15		
	38:12 49:22	<b>Columbia</b> 2:12		
	52:14 54:19	295:21		
	192:6 208:2	<b>combat</b> 212:6,7		
	<b>classical</b> 268:15	<b>combination</b>		
	<b>classify</b> 172:13	149:4		

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

306

96:22 97:14 154:17 <b>competent</b> 278:1 <b>competition</b> 85:20 238:18 239:2 <b>complaint</b> 32:6 32:8 33:22 <b>complementary</b> 107:21 <b>complete</b> 25:7 25:12 274:9 283:9 291:18 294:6 <b>completely</b> 69:10 90:14 113:5 129:21 137:17 171:13 197:17 <b>complex</b> 103:19 106:2,17,18 107:3 137:3 213:1 215:17 <b>complexities</b> 63:1 <b>complexity</b> 45:21 46:14 46:15,19 76:1 83:2,10 94:4 104:4 107:22 136:14,18 <b>complicity</b> 113:18 136:2 <b>component</b> 46:6 211:4 <b>components</b> 44:9 46:5 171:4 208:20 244:13 <b>compound</b> 84:1 276:11 <b>concede</b> 280:2 <b>conceivable</b> 74:2,14 174:15	<b>conceivably</b> 116:22 <b>concept</b> 17:10 70:5 81:19 83:1 110:15 138:1,2,6 139:5 140:22 143:19 144:14 144:22 145:2 154:22 155:1,2 155:13 157:6 163:3 175:7,9 175:10,16 178:1 186:8 210:16 225:9 226:10,12,15 226:17 228:20 229:18 240:15 <b>conception</b> 251:14 <b>concepts</b> 141:2 <b>conceptual</b> 109:12 141:4 <b>conceptualities</b> 71:12 <b>conceptualizing</b> 128:4 <b>concern</b> 50:11 121:16 171:22 <b>concerned</b> 29:5 48:9 128:14 163:17 <b>concerns</b> 181:10 185:18 215:3 <b>conclude</b> 78:1 161:5 219:8,17 220:18 287:4 <b>concluded</b> 219:2 287:18 293:7 <b>concludes</b> 84:18 172:9 <b>concluding</b> 161:8 <b>conclusion</b> 14:19 29:14,17	47:8 51:17 73:13 74:8 82:7 83:13 84:5 85:10,18 93:7 137:4,7 156:2,15 171:18 172:1 214:16 219:13 220:12,13 233:4 252:18 253:2,3,5,8 254:11 256:1 <b>conclusions</b> 22:22 37:11 43:21 106:8 231:14 <b>concrete</b> 224:20 <b>conditioned</b> 56:8,9,9 278:5 278:6 <b>conditions</b> 97:22 <b>conducted</b> 43:7 <b>confined</b> 284:21 <b>confirm</b> 231:20 <b>confirmation</b> 283:20 <b>conflate</b> 195:1 263:17 <b>conflated</b> 44:11 244:14 <b>conflating</b> 59:10 59:13 <b>conform</b> 111:6 113:12 <b>conforming</b> 111:22 <b>conformity</b> 176:14 280:4 <b>confuse</b> 58:13 192:9 206:10 265:3,4 266:7 <b>confusing</b> 14:10 50:7 59:14 60:12 86:13	189:22 239:5 264:21 265:1 <b>confusion</b> 179:5 207:12 <b>connected</b> 220:10,11 223:15,16 <b>connections</b> 229:9 <b>connotation</b> 129:1 <b>consensus</b> 199:22 234:16 235:3,4 <b>consequence</b> 187:5 215:21 <b>consequences</b> 231:12 <b>conservative</b> 290:14 <b>consider</b> 14:16 14:17 34:18 36:18 39:7,12 40:5,10 41:12 42:7,10,13 43:10,13,14 49:22 59:9 63:10,15 72:17 81:11 109:3 129:22 130:8 171:21 177:7 179:15 192:22 209:9 261:10 266:16 269:14 <b>considerable</b> 30:14,17 <b>considerations</b> 177:11 <b>considered</b> 8:11 31:17 34:15 44:12 48:6 51:3,10 111:15 116:2 160:3 208:14 <b>consist</b> 176:14	226:8 <b>consistent</b> 69:10 165:17 229:18 229:22 <b>consists</b> 72:21 192:20 <b>constant</b> 146:18 <b>constantly</b> 122:6 168:8 <b>constants</b> 98:1 <b>constitute</b> 41:16 42:5 105:13 <b>constitutes</b> 89:5 <b>Constitution</b> 203:22 <b>constitutional</b> 36:19 <b>constraints</b> 173:4 <b>constructed</b> 278:15,16 <b>construed</b> 159:8 <b>consult</b> 31:6,7,8 <b>consulted</b> 31:9 <b>contact</b> 27:10 118:12 257:14 257:15 259:4 260:2 264:5 266:4 <b>contacted</b> 12:21 13:4 <b>contacts</b> 43:9,12 <b>contagion</b> 241:12 <b>contain</b> 25:7 27:14 <b>contained</b> 198:6 198:16 <b>contains</b> 146:9 <b>contaminated</b> 275:16 <b>contemplating</b> 139:2 <b>contemporaries</b> 119:15
--	--	---	---	---

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

307

<b>contemporary</b> 70:3 107:16 121:1 140:9 211:10 217:20 242:8 261:5 279:2	<b>control</b> 71:1 224:7 <b>controls</b> 70:20 <b>controversial</b> 20:16 79:11,13 192:1 <b>controversy</b> 157:19 192:13 192:14,15,16 192:19 193:4 200:10,12,14 200:14,18 205:3,13 206:18,21 <b>conventional</b> 48:7 110:19 <b>convergence</b> 226:18 <b>conversant</b> 184:10 <b>conversation</b> 49:14 159:10 180:16 193:19 194:2,6 <b>conversations</b> 42:22 <b>conversion</b> 82:5 <b>convictions</b> 276:15,16 <b>convinced</b> 246:1 <b>cooperative</b> 234:22 <b>coopted</b> 23:3 <b>coordinated</b> 47:7 <b>Copernicus</b> 155:2,5 <b>copies</b> 9:12 <b>copy</b> 22:2,4 <b>correct</b> 7:15 20:8 28:20 41:7,9 44:20 46:21 47:2,13 47:21 51:14,19 60:21 76:9,15	78:3,20,22 80:14 93:15,21 94:7,14 99:10 100:22 102:5 103:7 113:4,15 114:13,16 116:19 121:12 121:14 123:9 123:11 126:17 126:21,22 132:3 135:2 143:20 144:12 145:4 149:22 150:9 154:7 159:1 161:6 168:5 169:2 170:13 173:17 176:11,21 177:6 178:7,8 191:15 195:4 195:10,14,21 197:21 204:16 208:18 209:17 210:1,11 212:13 218:21 220:9 222:14 223:2 228:4 230:9 232:10 232:21 241:4 249:10 252:19 255:3 256:2 262:12 263:21 264:15,19 269:4 271:20 286:3 294:6 295:5 <b>CORRECTI...</b> 296:7 297:7 <b>corrections</b> 294:7 <b>correctly</b> 38:17 290:21 <b>correlate</b> 268:7 <b>correlates</b> 219:9 <b>correspond</b>	109:16 <b>corresponding</b> 132:20 <b>corresponds</b> 142:11,13 <b>corroborated</b> 232:18 <b>cosmic</b> 140:16 <b>cosmology</b> 128:16 227:20 <b>cosufferer</b> 139:9 <b>cottage</b> 226:22 231:5 <b>Council</b> 273:4 273:10 <b>counsel</b> 5:4 7:21 8:2 28:10,10 28:12 295:9 <b>Counselor</b> 292:16 <b>counter-view...</b> 201:3 <b>country</b> 196:12 203:22 <b>couple</b> 25:6 60:14 <b>coupling</b> 248:17 <b>course</b> 17:18,19 22:19,19 25:15 35:14 38:18,21 49:6 50:6 85:2 96:15 97:20 110:12 140:13 171:6 195:15 198:21 204:21 204:21 216:20 240:1,14 246:22 247:10 263:6 273:14 278:7 289:13 291:14 <b>courses</b> 38:16 38:20,22 48:19 50:11 263:4 <b>court</b> 1:1 2:11	5:9 6:2,14,18 24:10 25:8 28:4 35:16,19 36:12 194:4 234:4,6 <b>courtroom</b> 5:17 <b>Craddock</b> 1:21 2:11 295:2 <b>create</b> 270:19,20 <b>created</b> 83:7 133:19 146:18 229:19 270:13 270:14 273:1 274:15 277:14 277:15 <b>creates</b> 137:19 137:19 271:16 271:17 <b>creation</b> 35:21 93:8 132:10,18 132:19 133:10 133:12,14 134:14 140:10 158:2 170:3 230:3 287:22 <b>creationism</b> 37:15,18 132:3 132:15,16 191:6 202:6,8 <b>creationist</b> 132:8 133:17 133:18 157:7 157:13,14,16 157:18 238:20 276:13 <b>creationists</b> 93:7 132:22 133:2,3 133:5,6,11,13 134:1,2,9,13 134:15 135:3,8 155:11 157:9 157:21 <b>creativity</b> 81:13 154:19 <b>creator</b> 54:2
--	---	---	--	---



DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

308

69:13,16 136:3 137:16 157:15 157:22 218:16 219:9 229:22 269:21 288:1 <b>credence</b> 208:17 <b>credibility</b> 288:12 <b>credible</b> 43:10 43:13,15 <b>creed</b> 156:11 269:11 270:5 283:9,11 284:2 284:3 291:18 291:18 292:11 <b>crept</b> 153:20 <b>Crick</b> 168:7 174:6,18 <b>crisp</b> 228:1 <b>criteria</b> 116:18 133:18 134:2 <b>criterion</b> 116:20 134:16 <b>critical</b> 49:9,15 49:19 50:5,7 50:10,11,13,14 109:14 119:18 128:7,9 143:8 143:22 150:7 203:18 204:12 204:14,20 263:13 <b>critically</b> 263:9 263:11,18 264:5,6 <b>criticism</b> 29:5 55:12 81:18 129:12 191:11 191:13 <b>criticize</b> 108:13 108:21 <b>criticized</b> 108:18,19 <b>criticizing</b> 18:5 <b>critique</b> 21:10	<b>cross</b> 202:11,12 <b>cross-examina...</b> 28:15 <b>cross-examini...</b> 28:12 <b>cross-section</b> 140:16 242:8 <b>crucified</b> 288:8 289:11 <b>crude</b> 62:9 <b>cultural</b> 56:8,14 79:15 <b>culturally</b> 56:8 212:2 <b>culture</b> 211:10 215:7 <b>cumulative</b> 158:10 <b>curiosity</b> 280:8 281:8 <b>current</b> 11:22 223:17 <b>curriculum</b> 4:9 4:12 9:12,22 33:6 182:4 196:6,9,20 233:9 <b>cut</b> 53:4 87:11 <b>cycling</b> 146:19 <b>C-H-A-R-D-I-N</b> 19:19  <b>D</b> <b>D 5:1</b> <b>Dana</b> 1:21 2:10 295:2 <b>dark</b> 227:1 <b>Darwin</b> 15:2,3 16:19 17:4,6,7 21:3,4,16 23:2 27:19 38:11 43:19,20 46:10 48:11 50:19 51:18,20 52:9 53:4 54:13	66:8 71:8 79:22 91:15 93:20,22 101:18,22 106:1,6,12 107:16 108:12 119:10 120:3 127:4 129:15 131:10 137:8 137:15,17 139:7 153:2 154:21 157:19 178:3 200:17 200:17 248:19 249:4 262:20 266:20 289:5 <b>Darwinian</b> 45:18 46:18 66:12 67:21 90:22 96:18 101:15,17,21 102:13 106:11 107:17 130:3 136:16 137:5 144:18 151:3,8 151:17 152:22 155:19,20,21 166:2 176:1 179:2 186:4,12 186:19 190:6,9 190:19 192:17 199:22 205:14 205:16 207:11 210:3 211:14 214:9 233:4 237:11 239:3 247:21 251:5 252:1 254:17 262:11,13,20 <b>Darwinians</b> 163:14,15 164:12,21 168:1 170:16 178:13 179:1 186:17 209:10	209:22 210:4 262:17,19 <b>Darwinism</b> 126:6 131:10 151:12,14 152:15,19 153:7,13 155:9 157:1 178:13 200:22 209:16 212:4,7 237:10 237:18 238:9 <b>Darwinist</b> 166:9 <b>Darwinists</b> 66:5 67:4 87:13 126:18 155:16 177:19 200:21 249:9 <b>Darwin's</b> 21:21 45:8 48:12 90:18 91:2,11 91:19 95:11 96:4,7,16 100:22 102:2 102:18 106:9 108:7,10 120:3 126:7 130:1 137:22 141:17 144:11,14,16 144:19 145:7 145:19 146:8 147:3,14 148:4 149:11 150:8 154:21 155:13 155:18 156:15 158:5,8 159:6 162:21 181:11 183:9,14 187:1 194:17 198:11 199:13 204:16 205:4,20 222:15 223:6 227:5 238:18 <b>data</b> 55:9,12 82:21 83:13 85:11 90:4,15	93:4 102:20,20 103:1,3,5,6,8 104:22 105:2,2 105:11,12 109:11,16 110:13 117:21 128:5 129:4 141:3,14,14 142:4,7,8,11 142:12,13 200:7 228:3 230:13,13 231:19,20 234:13 242:18 <b>date</b> 10:12 12:3 12:4 44:22 294:11 296:22 297:22 <b>dating</b> 90:8 <b>daughter</b> 147:18 <b>David</b> 135:14 <b>Dawkins</b> 67:7 122:5 125:11 125:14 152:6 165:9 167:6 244:6 245:5 249:7 263:16 <b>day</b> 9:8 61:22 162:21 175:20 186:5 219:14 221:7 225:16 232:22 272:5 276:14 282:9 292:13 295:13 <b>days</b> 132:19 133:20,20 <b>de</b> 19:18 20:6,7 23:19 118:17 <b>dead</b> 289:15 <b>deal</b> 21:14 39:5 75:2,6,10 99:19 140:16 172:6 176:5 207:8 221:8,13 221:14 261:20
---	---	--	--	--

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

309

263:9	200:17 240:10	141:1 159:20	<b>Dembski's</b> 22:5	147:3 149:21
<b>dealing</b> 35:16	266:20 267:18	159:21 175:15	169:12 171:14	150:2 209:13
142:17 196:6	271:19 287:17	175:19 239:10	<b>DeMille's</b> 287:7	210:3,5
199:14 211:20	288:6 289:5	240:3 241:7	<b>demonstrated</b>	<b>describe</b> 33:19
246:7 266:8	<b>deepest</b> 67:21	265:15 266:1	106:2	45:15 71:9
<b>deals</b> 21:17	81:11,12	266:20 268:9	<b>demonstrations</b>	166:12
39:18 117:11	178:16 277:19	268:12 269:2	99:20	<b>described</b>
139:16 175:5	<b>deeply</b> 19:20	270:21	<b>demote</b> 269:6	113:11 287:6
176:6 191:13	70:10 124:22	<b>definitional</b>	<b>demotion</b> 261:8	<b>describing</b>
211:1 254:15	125:2,8,10	210:3	<b>denial</b> 261:22	113:11 164:22
256:15	139:9 140:3	<b>definitions</b> 56:3	<b>denied</b> 70:7	166:11 284:7
<b>dealt</b> 196:1	151:18 186:20	159:16,19	<b>dense</b> 229:5	<b>description</b>
<b>death</b> 288:6	250:3 285:21	160:16 161:1,2	<b>deny</b> 51:6 58:17	71:16 106:7
290:6	285:22 287:2	161:4 173:12	149:20 208:21	267:5
<b>debates</b> 96:10	<b>defeat</b> 290:7	175:16 268:7,8	261:17 262:7	<b>descriptions</b>
193:5,15	<b>defend</b> 211:12	<b>definitive</b> 94:1	287:12	108:15 162:6
<b>debating</b> 27:17	<b>defendant</b> 8:12	<b>degree</b> 15:7	<b>department</b>	<b>deserve</b> 178:16
170:6 193:6	<b>defendants</b> 1:10	136:10 196:18	36:5	<b>design</b> 14:4,21
<b>decide</b> 112:17	3:12 4:8 5:4	236:10 247:1	<b>depends</b> 277:18	15:8,13,17,21
181:18 234:6	6:10 9:11,14	247:16 248:7	<b>depicting</b> 284:6	15:22 16:1,10
288:15,20	9:18 24:2,3,8	<b>deistic</b> 137:9,18	<b>depiction</b> 10:4	16:14,17 17:11
<b>decided</b> 36:13	26:1,4 27:6	138:6	<b>DEPONENT</b>	17:12 18:5,22
61:3 63:20	32:20 33:5	<b>deity</b> 174:5	294:1	19:6,9,11 20:1
117:16 235:11	34:1	251:15	<b>deposed</b> 5:9	21:14,16 27:17
<b>decision</b> 24:22	<b>defense</b> 28:10	<b>deliberately</b>	<b>deposition</b> 1:13	27:18,20 28:22
<b>decisions</b> 275:15	28:12 131:15	58:9,11 117:15	2:1 4:8 6:9	29:5 31:20
276:4	181:17	221:12	7:21 8:15 9:4	35:17 37:15,18
<b>declared</b> 135:17	<b>define</b> 55:16	<b>delight</b> 69:17	9:14 24:3	43:22 44:5,12
<b>deem</b> 233:22	64:5 78:10,14	<b>delineating</b>	32:20 199:13	44:12 47:10
234:1	142:2 150:15	242:5	293:7 295:4	48:6 50:1,20
<b>deemed</b> 233:19	150:20 159:14	<b>demand</b> 197:3	<b>depositions</b> 6:1	51:1,7,9,17
<b>deep</b> 14:8 51:22	266:22 273:3	<b>demarcation</b>	6:16	51:19,22 52:7
54:8 77:1	<b>defined</b> 60:14	72:12 74:13	<b>deprivation</b>	52:11 54:21
128:17,17	115:22 141:7	<b>demarcations</b>	200:2	64:9,19,21
178:11 211:11	162:15 185:3	56:3	<b>depth</b> 27:20	65:7,10,11,21
272:6,7 275:5	185:13 200:20	<b>Dembs</b> 245:6	155:10 215:18	66:3,7,9,19,19
<b>deeper</b> 15:3	289:3	<b>Dembski</b> 23:5	266:22 267:2,6	74:22 76:2,8
21:3,15 27:19	<b>Defining</b> 242:4	42:13,21 43:1	268:2,5,10,16	76:13 77:6,7,8
66:8 74:7	<b>definite</b> 41:15	43:9 59:6	268:18	77:15 78:1,2
77:14,14 79:21	<b>definitely</b> 59:2	78:19 89:16	<b>descended</b> 147:4	78:18 81:19,20
79:22,22 84:19	<b>definition</b> 42:16	90:12 158:19	<b>descendants</b>	82:8 83:10
88:17,18	54:22 55:14	161:20 179:20	104:10,11,12	86:4,20 87:8
108:12 127:4	56:1 59:7 64:1	191:18 208:22	277:6	90:1,14 93:6
129:15 139:7	87:13 115:11	214:7 220:16	<b>descent</b> 104:6	98:16,16,19
151:10 161:14	132:14 139:18	245:6	145:11,16	105:6 111:20

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

310

115:10 120:5	210:7,16 211:3	266:4,5 284:19	devised 61:7	differentiating
120:10 121:19	211:17 213:18	desires 111:6	devotion 71:22	239:20
121:21 122:3	214:1,4 215:10	124:18,21	Dhobzhansky	differentiations
123:12,14	215:10 216:11	detail 33:20	23:22	231:1,3
125:6,7 130:5	217:5,6,7,13	102:12 172:2	dialogue 69:12	differently 23:7
132:3,12	217:20 218:15	detailed 24:17	246:2,18	23:7
134:22 135:5,6	219:2,5,12,20	25:11 92:17	Dick 80:3	differs 187:1,3,5
135:8,9,13,15	221:1,15 233:6	105:22 189:13	died 288:9	difficult 159:4
135:17,18	233:9,19 234:1	detailing 85:6	289:11	dig 267:18
136:5,8,9,11	235:5,17 239:5	details 154:8	differ 253:7	dimension 89:9
136:13,19	243:1,2,4,8,11	detect 51:8	256:2	89:10 216:1
139:16 149:16	243:14,14,21	detected 101:9	difference 72:20	268:2,18
149:20 150:7	244:2,5,16	detection 74:18	88:2 132:2,5	dinosaurs 152:1
151:5 157:3,7	245:17 246:20	detects 220:15	158:4,7 167:10	direct 140:21
158:13 159:5	247:6,18	determine	205:1 206:15	238:18 269:3,5
160:20 161:5,8	250:15 251:5	196:19	differences	directed 52:6
161:16,18	251:15,22	determined	37:13 151:17	191:5
163:2,22	252:5 253:14	123:7 234:22	different 18:1	direction 6:21
164:11 165:18	254:15 255:13	determining	50:12,13 57:21	67:12 68:10,11
165:21 166:9	258:3,18 261:6	196:9	58:18 61:19	295:8
167:14,16	261:11,15	deterministic	69:20 72:19	directional
169:8,13,22	263:2,15,21	69:4	78:11 80:11,15	103:18
170:6,22	264:9,14,18	detract 7:6	80:17 83:1	directionality
173:10,15	265:5,7,11,13	develop 28:1	96:20 98:4	68:14 94:3
174:3 175:11	266:16,17	49:15,15 62:22	100:2,2 104:8	directly 51:10
176:2,9,10,15	288:22	68:5 69:11	105:9 107:4	104:16 176:12
176:19 177:2	designed 78:17	71:8 117:3	109:2 113:5	179:9 181:16
179:8 180:10	78:17 167:21	developed 28:22	115:20 117:1,8	218:22 254:8
180:18 181:2,6	168:9 169:1,1	70:3 88:11,14	133:16,22	265:8
181:8 186:3,8	169:3	117:6 118:20	135:7 140:12	director 231:11
186:19,22	designer 64:22	121:3 189:18	147:13 157:20	Directors 1:9
187:10,17	65:12 78:3	228:18 232:5,6	171:13 188:1	4:11 24:13
190:11,18,20	173:17,22	287:22	189:22 190:2	296:4 297:4
191:2,6,14	175:7 219:2,8	developing	200:10 204:7	directs 6:19 8:2
192:14,17,20	designers 168:3	28:22 64:1	204:13 205:1	103:4
193:7 194:17	designing	174:18 207:15	206:15 219:13	dirty 161:12
194:19,21	156:19	development	219:18 239:18	disagree 37:12
195:13 200:13	desire 57:19,20	46:17 94:15	245:15 246:10	57:16 59:6
201:15 202:1	116:11,12,12	117:5,8 152:2	246:11 247:9	143:12 146:14
202:16,22	124:16,17,18	284:14	248:12 256:6	202:5 274:16
205:5,14,15	124:19,19,21	developments	258:14,15,16	disagreed 37:10
206:1 207:10	124:22,22	101:19	266:2,2,6,6	disagreement
207:14 208:9	211:12 239:13	develops 110:20	267:9 270:9,11	87:22
209:3,5,7,9,16	239:14,17,18	device 167:7	280:12 284:8	disagreements
209:17,19	240:18 241:11	devise 196:6	284:12,13	37:19

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

311

<b>disappearance</b> 91:19	259:18	212:14 221:4	<b>docens</b> 273:6	8:8,11 13:18
<b>disappoints</b> 267:16	<b>discussed</b> 17:10	247:7	<b>doctrine</b> 93:7	14:3 24:12,12
<b>disassociate</b> 125:1 212:19	17:14 173:14	<b>distinctions</b>	214:15 230:3	35:2 96:9
<b>disburses</b> 259:21	235:3	34:19 37:17	275:8 276:3	182:3 197:7,8
<b>Disciples</b> 290:3	<b>discusses</b> 47:11	65:14 160:2	278:15 281:6	203:1 233:12
290:19	47:20	205:12 206:12	282:22 286:7	250:7,22 252:5
<b>discipline</b> 48:8	<b>discussing</b>	241:10	287:22 289:1	253:22 256:22
71:9 73:7	245:10 288:22	<b>distinctly</b> 72:18	<b>document</b> 9:11	264:8 296:2,3
111:9 112:12	289:4	<b>distinguish</b>	32:13,14,16,17	297:2,3
116:17 223:9	<b>discussion</b> 11:20	50:15 53:19,20	33:8 143:2	<b>Dover's</b> 235:6
<b>disciplined</b>	27:18 48:18	56:16 77:21	183:1,21	<b>down</b> 6:3 39:11
111:22 112:2	53:12 59:4	122:17 130:19	260:21 274:21	57:21 73:17
112:10	66:22 70:13,19	215:1 225:7	278:6	88:21 106:5
<b>disciplines</b>	100:7 132:9	262:16 263:18	<b>documents</b> 31:4	187:8 216:16
57:18 72:10	184:8,11	<b>distinguished</b>	31:8 32:1	220:13 221:22
90:6 116:1	188:12 207:6	12:17 14:11	<b>doing</b> 26:8	239:18 262:3
240:21 248:12	245:10,22	<b>distinguishing</b>	43:14,15 49:20	280:5 286:2
<b>discourse</b> 73:7	247:15 253:16	242:7	53:17 63:18	<b>Dr</b> 191:4
105:13 128:19	265:18 274:8	<b>district</b> 1:1,2,7,8	64:14 74:10	<b>draw</b> 47:8 93:7
130:18 180:6	<b>discussions</b>	2:12 8:9,11	75:1 76:10,12	214:17 281:7
223:5 235:16	15:17 53:22	24:10,11,12,13	82:9,11 84:21	<b>drawing</b> 137:7
253:15	112:21 257:18	35:3 182:3	84:21 97:18	<b>drawn</b> 85:18
<b>discover</b> 51:20	<b>disengaged</b>	188:21,22	98:13,16 111:2	177:1 228:2
256:18	126:6	196:2 197:8	111:4 120:19	<b>Drive</b> 3:15
<b>discovered</b> 54:9	<b>disingenuous</b>	250:7 252:5	122:8 125:14	<b>drugs</b> 7:6
131:10 141:19	194:10	254:1 256:22	125:19 129:6	<b>due</b> 275:18
162:12,22	<b>dislike</b> 163:21	295:21 296:3,3	131:8 137:7	<b>Dulles</b> 290:13
183:16 232:1,2	<b>disobeys</b> 111:15	297:3,3	168:16 190:17	<b>duplication</b>
<b>discoveries</b>	<b>dispense</b> 127:11	<b>districts</b> 191:22	192:5 212:2	143:1
102:15 145:15	<b>dispute</b> 194:15	<b>diversification</b>	219:3 220:5,22	<b>during</b> 7:21
<b>discovers</b> 208:5	194:16 210:10	148:2 153:18	221:17,17	20:18 38:19
<b>discovery</b> 88:16	210:12	<b>diversity</b> 147:17	224:13,19	92:18 182:10
141:3 231:10	<b>dissent</b> 274:17	152:4 153:12	239:3 242:3	182:11 290:5
256:5	<b>distancing</b>	209:21 237:13	256:5 261:17	<b>duty</b> 34:15
<b>discursive</b> 52:22	276:14 282:10	<b>divine</b> 51:11	276:15	264:3
<b>discuss</b> 21:21	<b>distinct</b> 44:9	58:22 59:1	<b>Dominicans</b>	<b>dying</b> 232:22
22:12 27:19	69:7 124:7	81:12 86:19	70:16	291:22
47:22 50:19	139:21 143:7	98:8 133:10	<b>done</b> 50:6 74:21	<b>D-E</b> 19:19
72:5,10,11	146:9 223:16	139:3,13,14	75:17 86:6	<b>D.C.</b> 1:14 2:7
80:2 89:3	246:14	157:22 229:22	179:1 246:18	<b>E</b>
161:17 188:16	<b>distinction</b> 73:4	261:22 262:3	268:16,16	<b>E</b> 3:1,1 4:1,7 5:1
	73:4 85:19	286:13	<b>double</b> 264:20	5:1 296:1,1,1
	124:4 132:13	<b>divinize</b> 285:13	<b>doubt</b> 53:3	297:1,1,1
	151:12 152:14	285:16	<b>Douglas</b> 248:13	<b>each</b> 38:19
	152:20 204:13	<b>DNA</b> 169:6,10	<b>Dover</b> 1:7,8 4:11	



DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

312

97:13,14 98:10 117:13 133:10 190:1,3 246:10 275:13 <b>earlier</b> 13:3 17:12 44:1 51:5 62:3 109:6,21 132:1 173:20 182:2 197:18 211:20 223:4 229:2 238:8 246:22 262:10 263:5 266:5 278:11 281:2 283:8 <b>earliest</b> 15:20 <b>early</b> 18:6 19:4 81:20 290:19 <b>earth</b> 93:15 116:12 133:1,2 133:3,4,5,6,8 133:11,13,19 147:7 171:16 174:7,11,13 229:19 269:3 269:12,15,18 270:6 271:7 286:3 <b>earther</b> 155:4 <b>ease</b> 144:6 <b>easily</b> 44:11 82:16 239:15 265:14 <b>eastern</b> 285:11 <b>ecclesia</b> 273:6,6 <b>eclipse</b> 153:8,13 <b>economic</b> 56:22 213:4 <b>educate</b> 34:16 208:4 215:5 <b>educated</b> 201:18 224:22 <b>education</b> 41:11 41:13,16 42:3 42:6 49:17,18	54:18 187:22 200:2 206:5,17 239:12 242:13 249:21 <b>educational</b> 201:20 206:13 213:5 <b>educator</b> 181:14 224:13 <b>educators</b> 50:11 264:4 <b>Edwards</b> 36:7,9 <b>effect</b> 14:12 76:2 76:16,20 81:21 155:7 175:3,22 176:13 202:22 251:6,13 275:20 <b>effective</b> 241:14 <b>efficient</b> 55:8 100:9 172:2 221:8 <b>Eighteenth</b> 3:7 <b>Einstein</b> 228:11 229:13,14 232:11,13 235:21 <b>either</b> 39:18 60:4 66:2 68:3 68:7 95:18 119:8 147:18 231:20 236:21 237:1 265:4 <b>either/or</b> 83:8 <b>electromagnetic</b> 95:17 <b>element</b> 90:10 145:11,12 <b>elements</b> 110:6 144:9 146:12 <b>elevate</b> 154:1 <b>elicit</b> 245:11 283:14 <b>eliminate</b> 124:12,15	<b>eliminating</b> 241:6 <b>eloquent</b> 227:4 <b>eloquently</b> 227:11 <b>elsewhere</b> 14:13 275:18 <b>eluded</b> 145:18 <b>elusive</b> 86:5 <b>embarrassed</b> 164:18 <b>embarrassment</b> 127:9 128:22 <b>embed</b> 127:12 129:4 <b>embedding</b> 201:12,14 <b>emerged</b> 273:9 <b>emergence</b> 98:3 98:4 <b>emphases</b> 23:1 <b>emphasis</b> 66:14 <b>emphasize</b> 56:7 110:14 170:14 <b>emphasized</b> 37:16 <b>emphasizing</b> 210:13 <b>empirical</b> 53:7 62:1 82:21 83:13 85:11 89:9,19,21 90:2,10,15 103:4 109:7 117:5 141:14 143:16 <b>empirically</b> 66:11 84:15 113:13 118:11 141:5 142:4 <b>empiricism</b> 117:11,20 118:3,20,21 119:1 <b>employed</b>	282:20 295:9 <b>employing</b> 71:12 <b>employs</b> 127:5 <b>encounter</b> 71:4 267:10,10,11 267:11,12 <b>encountered</b> 155:9 208:2 257:20 <b>encouraged</b> 188:6 <b>encourages</b> 49:19 <b>encumber</b> 244:13 <b>encumbered</b> 251:19 <b>end</b> 21:13 48:22 54:11 141:9 168:10 195:5 207:13 218:17 246:6 248:21 260:19 263:11 <b>ending</b> 59:13 <b>endless</b> 75:22 227:21 <b>endorsement</b> 63:8 <b>end-all</b> 209:6 <b>energetic</b> 44:9 <b>energized</b> 243:20 <b>energizing</b> 76:17 77:9 <b>energy</b> 166:16 <b>enfolds</b> 160:6 <b>engineer</b> 156:19 <b>engineering</b> 78:20 79:10 157:2,3 <b>enhanced</b> 145:14 <b>enjoy</b> 48:14 <b>enjoyed</b> 48:12	<b>enormous</b> 147:17 235:1 261:4 <b>enough</b> 21:9 73:8 90:12 94:2,3 109:10 129:4 142:9 151:9 152:5 206:11 210:19 <b>enriched</b> 48:19 49:5,7,11 <b>enriches</b> 49:10 <b>enrichment</b> 49:10 <b>ensure</b> 202:12 <b>entail</b> 174:4 <b>entails</b> 174:2 177:21 <b>enter</b> 59:4 153:22 <b>enterprise</b> 76:21 77:9 <b>enthusiastic</b> 243:20 <b>entire</b> 31:14,15 221:3 233:5,17 235:6 <b>entirely</b> 57:13 185:1,20 202:21 203:16 220:5 <b>entities</b> 163:17 <b>entitled</b> 9:11 32:18 33:5 45:8 <b>environment</b> 186:1 224:4,15 <b>environmenta...</b> 224:22 <b>Eocene</b> 92:19 <b>equation</b> 216:14 241:7 <b>equilibrium</b> 93:17,19 94:9 <b>Ernst</b> 145:20
---	---	--	---	---

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

313

146:3,6 147:11	evaluating	54:17 74:3	evident 101:7	101:19 106:13
Errata 294:8	215:14	92:1 102:10	142:4	106:15,17
erroneous 73:15	evangelicals	104:20 135:16	evil 272:11,16	108:20,20
73:19	70:4	153:9 169:8	275:16	127:5,10,15
erroneously	evangelists	178:3 196:1,5	evolution 17:16	128:10 129:12
23:3	290:11	220:14 223:5	18:4 21:22	131:4 139:10
especially 15:10	Eve 274:22	230:20 231:10	23:17,21 30:19	148:5,22
17:20 62:2	275:1,2 276:5	231:17 248:13	34:20 35:17	153:12 155:6
68:17 92:4	277:14,22	273:21 284:20	46:11 51:1	157:1,4,8
101:20 129:6	even 28:11	everlasting	53:15 90:4,4	177:13 188:4
134:19 144:8	62:12 68:22	228:12 232:12	90:11 91:2,11	190:8 199:9
202:13 207:9	74:2 77:8	every 34:5 84:7	92:17 95:21,21	244:1,17
213:3 217:8	89:14 100:14	87:1 90:19	101:21 106:13	249:12 253:16
242:12 250:2	107:16 110:9	102:9,9 108:9	108:8,10 120:4	273:17
250:18 258:17	119:18 124:11	127:17 129:20	121:20 122:12	evolutionist
260:3	126:11,14	131:5,5 132:11	128:12,16	146:7 231:18
espousing	136:12 152:5	147:4 149:2	132:9 144:17	evolutionists
122:21	156:13 158:12	156:11 168:16	144:18,19	65:5,8 67:3
Esquire 3:4,13	158:16 166:16	200:5 202:7	145:19 146:17	79:2 88:1,3
essay 17:5 170:5	168:1 170:15	209:18,19	149:13 152:22	89:14 94:8
170:6	175:18 176:1	225:15 233:1	154:21 155:18	108:13,14
essays 20:15,15	178:12 192:4	241:2 248:4	156:16 158:5,5	127:20 128:8
45:13 170:4	201:19 202:5,8	250:16 261:1	158:8,13 159:6	157:5 192:17
essence 139:3	207:10 216:9	284:1	165:7 177:6,8	200:13 210:17
essential 51:10	216:12 219:11	everybody	177:9,14	evolve 147:21
116:17	223:4 225:4	69:19 132:6	182:16 183:5	evolved 107:1
essentially	229:20 234:11	197:3 219:12	183:10,11	144:17 145:17
200:16 208:16	241:20 243:17	219:15,15	189:11 193:7	168:10
established	247:4 250:13	257:1 273:13	194:17 198:1	evolving 22:17
231:17	266:10 269:11	275:21	198:11,17	236:7 292:8
establishment	271:21 274:18	Everyone 64:5	199:2,4,14	exact 108:11
61:4 147:19	279:15 283:14	72:7 80:9	200:1 205:4,20	255:9
estimation	284:9 287:11	everything 33:1	205:21 211:14	exactly 33:18
133:8	event 154:13	33:13 69:5	227:21 231:18	44:21 82:11
et 1:4 24:12	174:15 280:10	70:12,20 71:1	237:20,21	98:15 101:17
222:7 296:2	events 55:7 69:9	71:2 94:6	242:17 247:8	102:20 126:19
297:2	69:9,10 100:21	201:8 220:11	248:14 259:9	144:18 157:6
eternal 228:12	108:15 151:21	236:4 271:16	266:8 273:15	EXAMINATI...
eternally 229:20	287:18	271:17	273:19 274:12	4:2 5:4
ethical 177:3,16	eventually 18:21	evidence 64:19	evolutionary	examinations
177:16 178:15	98:2 109:11	64:21 101:5	14:5,16 50:3	247:13
178:17 179:3	183:10 246:4	102:17,19,21	53:8 68:17	examine 109:15
ethics 71:18	287:21	141:18 144:5	71:4 76:5	243:18 263:9
176:18,18	ever 5:8 11:10	183:16 184:22	79:10 90:15	263:11 264:6
evades 66:22	11:13 13:22	185:7 286:12	93:9 99:5	examined 294:4

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

314

<b>examines</b> 63:2	<b>excuse</b> 8:17	<b>experience</b>	30:14 56:6	151:10,16
<b>examining</b>	40:21 79:3	117:14 160:14	180:10 290:10	153:16 154:14
242:7	87:8 92:8	165:2 166:18	<b>Expires</b> 295:15	156:8 163:4,5
<b>example</b> 23:1	118:6 121:20	166:19,20	<b>explain</b> 46:18	163:5 168:20
35:21 37:14	172:17	167:3 241:14	49:3 62:20	170:21 171:1
50:14 54:4	<b>exemplification</b>	267:9,20	63:1,22 66:13	171:13 172:5
55:18 58:19	131:11	268:20 287:19	81:6 87:9 88:5	172:22 173:3
67:18 75:22	<b>exhaust</b> 292:6	290:4	91:4 95:15	176:2 185:13
90:4 91:7	<b>exhausted</b> 87:1	<b>experienced</b>	96:16,19,19	186:22 187:12
92:18 93:1	<b>exhaustive</b>	55:10	97:4,9,11,18	189:22 190:3
97:2 98:12	100:13 268:22	<b>experiences</b>	97:20 98:2	205:17 206:16
105:14 107:18	<b>exhaustively</b>	125:17	111:19 112:5	209:20 237:13
109:21 112:5	66:13	<b>experiential</b>	116:15 131:15	237:16,17
113:21 115:9	<b>exhibit</b> 4:8 9:11	62:1 89:10	151:4 152:3,7	253:22 261:18
116:3,10,15	9:14,18 24:2,3	<b>experiment</b>	174:10,15	262:20,20
117:4,9,12	24:8 26:9	61:13 220:15	178:10 205:20	271:6
121:15 122:5	32:20 33:5	<b>experimentati...</b>	210:19 231:4	<b>explanations</b>
151:20 164:8	34:2 46:14	42:20 53:2	<b>explained</b> 91:10	51:21 62:15
165:9 166:17	159:13 182:10	92:22	91:12 136:2	85:22 97:12
170:5 172:4	198:6,16	<b>experimenting</b>	139:6 154:15	98:5 107:8,11
179:20 187:4	233:14,15	153:19	169:19	128:10 151:8
210:5 216:2	255:10	<b>experiments</b>	<b>explaining</b>	154:13 168:18
227:19 229:15	<b>exist</b> 184:21	111:6	45:18 47:9	171:11 176:2
230:21 232:3	<b>existed</b> 277:22	<b>expert</b> 6:10 8:4	51:9 93:17	177:11 179:2
238:8 249:8	<b>existence</b> 51:7	12:22 14:20	105:10 107:21	190:7 237:11
261:3 262:18	70:7 93:4	24:14 25:8	153:18 170:18	248:20
275:17 277:4,6	177:15 178:11	26:4,9,11,14	187:4,5	<b>explanatory</b>
290:13	272:14 287:20	27:5,8 28:4	<b>explains</b> 48:1	48:7 58:16
<b>exams</b> 181:21	291:15	29:2,3,15,15	67:5 137:10	107:21 120:11
<b>except</b> 215:3	<b>existing</b> 229:20	29:19 30:11	147:16	120:12 121:4
<b>exception</b>	<b>exists</b> 270:11,12	34:9,16 36:19	<b>explanation</b>	122:14 151:18
131:11 132:7	271:5	36:21 37:2,7	46:17,18 48:3	170:7,9 187:8
209:18 262:18	<b>Exodus</b> 288:3	39:7,9,12,16	51:12 63:10	193:1 261:19
<b>exceptional</b>	<b>expand</b> 255:18	39:18 40:5,10	64:12 66:3,6	<b>explicit</b> 16:18
279:8	<b>expanding</b>	40:12 41:12,14	67:1,22 70:6	252:14
<b>exceptions</b>	87:12 226:21	42:7 103:12	75:14,15,18	<b>explicitly</b> 14:1
134:5	<b>expansion</b> 229:1	142:17 146:2	84:17,20 86:20	176:22 183:20
<b>exchange</b> 45:1	<b>expect</b> 92:3	159:12,13	87:2,4 91:14	252:7 261:17
<b>exchanges</b> 45:3	191:22 192:4	173:12 202:17	96:21,22 97:1	273:9
<b>excited</b> 241:11	219:12 242:2	202:18,19	97:8,9,19	<b>exploded</b> 229:6
241:16	244:21	249:14	98:11,13,14,18	<b>exploration</b>
<b>excitedly</b> 97:7	<b>expectations</b>	<b>expertise</b> 42:2,4	99:2,4 102:2	75:12 88:18
<b>excites</b> 75:12	134:18	197:2 258:16	106:16 127:5	100:10 227:22
<b>excludes</b> 156:16	<b>expecting</b>	<b>experts</b> 26:1,4	129:12 136:16	<b>explorations</b>
<b>excluding</b> 66:2	245:19	26:13 27:10	137:12 141:8	90:7

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

315

explore 151:11 156:17 188:1 215:19 216:5 explored 102:7 explosion 91:18 93:11 100:20 103:7,9,11,15 103:16,17 104:3,5 228:18 explosive 103:16 expose 181:15 exposed 14:4 186:11,16 201:10 251:4 exposition 182:1 exposure 14:15 251:7 expounds 181:11 express 278:9 expressed 23:21 289:22 290:2 expression 127:6 130:17 189:21 269:17 270:3 expressions 190:13 extended 200:9 extent 28:10 159:7 extinct 96:12 222:20 extranatural 84:19 153:22 extraplanetary 174:22 extrascientific 82:20 216:5 extraterrestrial 174:7 175:8 eye 47:18 64:18 eyes 287:9,15 E.O 67:8 238:17 238:19,19	244:6 263:16  F F 1:13 2:1 4:2 4:10 5:2 9:12 293:7 294:3 fact 16:5 32:18 45:1,10 54:2 63:15 68:20 72:21 78:6 85:21 119:17 124:7 133:19 135:12 137:8,8 141:21 142:1,2 142:2,14,14 154:9 157:5,8 168:7,7 169:1 169:5 170:19 173:14 178:2 178:14 184:15 184:19 192:20 200:2 201:10 205:2 213:20 214:3 220:3 223:14 230:19 235:13,16 236:6,20 243:13 244:10 245:21 263:19 264:8 265:4 275:12 277:5,7 277:14,15 278:22 279:14 279:14,16 280:17 281:5 281:20,21 288:2,9 289:12 289:15,16,21 292:9 factor 65:17 212:16 214:1,3 factors 109:3,19 110:11 151:4 212:20 213:6 213:15 216:5,6	239:15 240:14 240:16 facts 127:22 280:20,20 factual 272:9 273:22 280:3 factually 132:20 failed 19:13 fair 60:5 82:4 122:18 181:22 fairly 92:16 273:15 faith 71:13 218:17 290:18 291:19 faithfully 284:1 fall 46:13 233:18 235:7 253:15 265:15 fallacy 122:9 fallible 236:2 falling 160:20 173:11 false 143:11 144:4 183:7 falsification 231:21 falsify 231:20 falsity 93:4 familiar 15:11 26:17 31:21 35:21 40:12 45:7,22 48:17 57:8 136:12 146:10 150:1 181:12 204:15 225:9 families 188:13 188:15,16 far 10:7 21:11 21:12 22:21 29:4 44:13 47:8 48:8 52:5 72:15 74:12 81:1 85:22	89:12 93:22 97:8 101:9 107:11 109:7,8 125:3 133:6 136:21 163:17 167:20 171:12 176:22 179:9 218:11 236:5 247:6 fashion 157:17 faster 94:11 Father 291:16 fauna 103:22 February 13:1 33:16,17,17 fecit 148:16,20 feel 206:22 feelings 19:6,7 feet 112:19 fellow 81:22 119:17,21 felt 34:14 few 5:22 48:20 67:8 93:2 121:9 125:21 149:3 159:16 229:11 247:3 257:20 field 34:19 39:8 39:20 40:4 55:10,13 56:6 63:6 86:3 102:11 123:10 186:6 187:9 190:6 208:6 260:3 fields 266:2,3,7 fifth 148:21 149:17 fighting 70:17 figurative 165:14 277:3 figuratively 164:13 277:6 figure 237:2	figured 75:18 154:6 figures 78:18 91:18 179:15 179:17 filed 8:8 32:7 filled 92:16 130:9 248:5,6 filling 92:4 127:20 filter 169:16,18 170:7,9 filtering 88:15 171:5 final 22:14 67:21 75:18 100:7 105:15 111:19 221:11 finally 70:15 75:17 financial 295:10 find 61:14 74:3 74:15 102:3 103:17 104:16 108:11 109:1 112:22 127:17 127:22 129:3 154:14 177:13 215:19 217:11 230:1 248:1 249:15 250:3 251:7,9 268:20 279:5 280:11 finding 6:10 62:10 92:19 222:15 finds 62:19 142:11 247:20 fine 225:8 finish 7:2 19:14 92:13 finished 21:12 152:10 219:1 firm 32:2 firmed 230:19
--	---	--	--	---



DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

316

<b>firmly</b> 231:17	<b>focus</b> 39:3 100:8	262:7	133:8 189:7	177:10 178:3
<b>first</b> 5:10 7:2	149:16 151:6	<b>formative</b> 19:20	198:19 246:10	179:4 185:22
16:9,18 19:2	159:4 251:16	<b>formed</b> 104:19	246:10 260:10	187:1,5 199:12
23:16,19 25:6	<b>focused</b> 44:1	171:20	267:9	204:7 210:20
51:22 61:7	<b>focuses</b> 189:1	<b>forms</b> 92:3,19	<b>fourth</b> 148:3	211:11 212:20
101:6 102:4	<b>follow</b> 5:21 6:20	92:22 103:19	<b>four-paragraph</b>	214:5 216:18
138:9,13,20,22	88:10 220:21	<b>formula</b> 116:16	198:16 265:5	217:21 218:9
159:22,22	<b>followed</b> 253:11	116:16 129:5	<b>framework</b>	219:1,13,18
160:2,13	<b>followers</b> 67:8	171:17 286:5	135:10 141:4	220:21 222:4
174:12 175:19	<b>following</b> 50:13	<b>formulas</b> 284:12	165:4 180:3	224:20 228:2,2
178:19 183:7	86:17 118:17	<b>formulation</b>	209:2,6 253:15	228:9,9 229:17
185:19 192:12	272:3	274:20	<b>frameworks</b>	231:17 238:10
200:19 232:11	<b>follows</b> 5:3	<b>formulations</b>	109:10	239:12 242:5,6
240:16 241:9	185:20 189:17	274:18	<b>Francis</b> 62:3	248:11 251:20
243:21 246:17	237:15	<b>Forrest</b> 26:19	168:7	257:14 258:15
250:11,13	<b>follow-up</b> 88:6	37:17 38:1,3	<b>Frank</b> 3:15	260:11 263:18
255:1 262:14	<b>football</b> 115:3	123:17	<b>Franks</b> 67:11	269:3 274:18
267:13 270:19	<b>footnote</b> 260:22	<b>forth</b> 95:2	<b>Fred</b> 232:22	275:11 276:14
273:1 279:4	<b>force</b> 153:22	124:19 125:18	<b>free</b> 55:16 64:5	282:10 286:18
<b>fit</b> 122:7 249:12	166:17,17	199:1 225:1	286:18,18	289:15 292:21
268:8	276:12 283:15	227:8 231:13	<b>Freud</b> 49:8	<b>front</b> 5:19
<b>fits</b> 175:19	<b>forces</b> 95:18	236:11 238:13	<b>Friedrich</b> 48:14	<b>frozen</b> 69:4
190:18	<b>forcing</b> 220:6	239:22	<b>from</b> 7:6 12:2,9	<b>fruitful</b> 88:17
<b>fittest</b> 177:22	<b>foregoing</b>	<b>fossil</b> 92:2 93:5	12:17 23:20	<b>fruitfulness</b>
<b>five</b> 18:1 101:7	189:17 294:5	94:2,4 101:5	37:8 40:3 44:9	61:9
146:9,12,16	295:4,5	227:7	44:13 53:21	<b>fulfilled</b> 249:5
147:13	<b>foreknowledge</b>	<b>fossilized</b> 92:1	55:12,19 56:17	<b>fulfillment</b>
<b>flagellum</b> 46:21	71:2	<b>fossils</b> 91:22	57:18 61:8,9	272:15 292:8
47:1 62:21	<b>Forever</b> 199:17	<b>found</b> 61:15	61:20 69:1,5,7	<b>fulfills</b> 268:12
64:18 82:7,22	<b>forget</b> 229:16	90:9 95:3,10	72:14,19 74:1	<b>full</b> 30:7 84:20
83:4,17 84:5	<b>forgetting</b>	103:6,8,11	80:12,19 81:7	90:9 102:1
85:1,8 86:5	205:12	104:15 127:1,6	81:14 82:12	182:1 247:1
87:10 100:15	<b>forgot</b> 228:14	153:10	94:3,15,21	271:9
105:5 106:8,14	291:21	<b>foundation</b> 61:6	95:1 96:8	<b>fullest</b> 181:15
106:18 107:6	<b>form</b> 28:1,2 47:9	61:20 77:11,18	100:3 107:4	<b>fullness</b> 291:19
195:8	104:13,15	135:18 259:16	111:2 116:22	<b>fully</b> 63:21
<b>flat</b> 155:4	108:22 142:6	259:21,21	124:7,10,16,20	102:11 107:17
<b>flaw</b> 78:22	276:7	260:6 269:8	125:2,2 126:6	156:10
<b>flawed</b> 250:4	<b>formal</b> 16:19	270:12,14	126:15 128:18	<b>fun</b> 232:19
<b>Flew</b> 135:19	40:1 73:3	<b>foundational</b>	129:7 139:21	<b>function</b> 46:7
137:14,21	100:7 103:13	79:19 110:2	140:12,20	107:5 152:8
<b>flow</b> 57:18 179:4	105:15 110:18	<b>foundations</b>	141:7 147:4	163:16 220:6,7
<b>flows</b> 57:21	221:11 273:21	218:20	155:22 161:22	240:21 254:16
124:16,20	<b>formally</b> 102:21	<b>founder</b> 147:20	162:17 163:7	262:13
<b>flunk</b> 246:21	105:10 251:3	<b>four</b> 38:14 99:17	166:18 167:3	<b>functioned</b>

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

319

himself 46:10 50:19 53:4 54:13 101:18 101:22 106:1,6 106:12 132:7 137:17 153:3 178:3 228:11 229:21 232:13 238:22	hominid 94:16 Hon 1:8 honest 184:1 236:8 285:2 honesty 283:9 291:18 hope 161:13 179:10 195:20 245:21 272:10 hopefully 245:10 horizon 268:17 horizons 75:11 75:22 hot 229:5 hour 34:5 256:13 hours 34:6 Hoyle 232:22 human 56:10 74:6 92:15 93:2 94:15 95:3 98:19 108:5 110:3 111:2 113:19 116:21 166:11 166:18,19 167:3 178:21 178:21 188:2 223:14 227:4 236:2 266:4 272:9 275:15 283:2 284:19 284:21 humanities 260:1 humankind 272:22 humanly 223:11 humans 92:17 94:21 242:13 humble 236:9 hundred 258:8 Hundreds 258:22 259:1	hurriedly 26:6 26:16 Huxley 18:14 hyper-Darwin... 152:6 Hypostatic 283:1 hypotheses 55:9 55:11 60:17 62:22 64:3 109:11,16 142:6 hypothesis 60:7 60:18 64:9 115:10 140:9 231:20 234:13 273:15 hypothetical 108:6 H <sub>2</sub> O 97:6 178:10  I Ian 18:8 ID 208:9 211:11 211:14 216:18 249:21 250:7 254:1 256:21 257:1,10,19 260:12 262:5,6 idea 46:8 60:10 67:4 68:20 72:8 82:2 105:17 117:1 124:20 144:8 150:1 153:4 156:19 157:6 162:19 165:4 170:21 194:19 204:20 206:21 208:8,16 209:1 212:17 213:12 213:21 225:15 227:22 229:12 229:17 230:4	233:1,2,2 235:14,19 238:11 243:20 246:20 251:7 251:19,19 257:10,20 258:7,18,19 281:6 ideal 127:15 197:3 206:16 ideally 201:21 ideas 35:22 50:9 53:10 54:20 61:13 90:8 108:1,1 122:6 122:16 124:16 135:11 145:5,5 145:15 153:21 204:1,4 212:20 212:21 215:1 217:12 218:10 236:9 244:14 263:10 identical 140:1 212:5 268:13 identification 9:15 24:4 32:21 273:19 identified 219:19 identify 9:19 24:8 60:17 99:21 273:11 identity 115:7 ideological 50:16 244:12 ideologies 60:3 ideology 14:18 59:22 66:18,21 213:2 214:6,11 238:7 239:5 253:18 263:17 263:18 ignorance 130:19,20,20	130:21 131:1,2 131:4,7,13 ignored 90:14 215:9 II 273:14 illegitimate 154:4 illogical 191:1 239:4 illuminate 240:11 imagine 69:3 imitated 179:21 immediate 51:11,21 immediately 31:17 117:14 219:9 245:14 immersion 155:6 impact 151:22 238:1 impacting 238:7 imperative 89:21 90:2 103:4 109:7,14 impersonal 222:9 implemented 132:21 implication 183:19 186:10 188:3 implications 54:8,9 177:1,4 177:16,17 178:15,18 179:4 225:14 225:16,18,22 implicit 176:17 176:17 177:22 190:12 221:6 238:7 250:14 251:3 252:10 252:14,18,19
--	---	--	--	---

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

320

255:20,21	improvement	inconceivable	inevitable 127:7	276:2
256:21 261:8	83:4 90:21	69:2	129:13 178:6	initial 97:22
261:12	inadequacy	inconsistent	inevitably 122:2	initiative 211:11
implicitly 14:10	19:7 274:9	70:21 144:10	174:2	initiatives
15:15 18:5	278:10	increases 94:5	inexhaustible	259:15,22
50:21 75:16	inadequate	increasing	268:1,10	injecting 165:18
76:12 172:18	21:18	102:20	infallible 274:21	injustice 275:20
176:4,16 177:3	inanimate 154:1	increasingly	inference	innately 240:17
180:1,2 201:11	inappropriate	39:4 55:20	169:12,18,22	inquiry 55:12
217:14 224:19	120:13 185:1	92:19	172:14 173:8	58:21 61:3
237:11 249:22	206:8 250:11	incremental	infinite 268:9	62:2 64:15,16
250:12,22	262:21,22	46:12,16	infinitely 229:4	75:16 79:15
252:16 253:1	inaudible	indeed 129:5	infinitesimal	98:20 102:11
254:19 256:16	228:22 238:3	222:9	73:9	105:16 107:10
261:16,16,21	incapable 45:18	indefinable	influence	115:8 120:20
262:19 274:19	215:2	78:13	139:14 261:4	208:6 239:21
277:1	incarnate 283:7	indefinite 75:11	information	240:10 254:21
implied 172:20	incarnation	indefinitely	23:2 44:10	262:4
184:7	286:4,7	87:11	53:7 127:12	inseparable
implying 186:15	incentive 77:3	independent	158:9 169:9,13	124:10 238:10
187:7	incidentally	213:4	170:21 184:2	insideness
importance 5:20	181:5 219:3	independently	201:12,15	117:13
160:4 222:7	inclined 67:12	218:12	203:10	insight 142:7
272:10	195:1 207:13	indicate 54:11	informational	insights 142:1
important 18:18	237:5	102:16 211:5	44:8 170:15,16	inspired 291:11
34:18 77:21	include 115:9	indicated 19:5	171:2,8	instead 208:15
96:10 116:14	140:7 160:1	28:18 34:4	informative	252:14 268:14
150:22 151:6	180:4 181:19	37:7 48:12	19:20	275:12
167:1,3 187:21	249:9	132:1 154:20	informed	instructed 200:4
231:10 242:12	included 32:12	182:5 204:10	274:11,13	instruction
256:14 288:7	33:11 51:22	indicates 143:5	ingenuously	189:1
impossible	includes 40:17	indicating	220:5	instrument
171:20 216:17	41:2 53:1	182:20	ingredients	204:6
imprecise	56:14 159:22	indirectly	109:17	instruments
165:15 167:5	238:11	176:12,13	inhere 99:21	89:11
imprecision	including 54:21	265:8	inherent 140:19	integrity 211:12
165:16	66:2 70:4	indispensable	inherently	intellectual
impression	81:12 108:9	44:18 242:18	203:10 208:10	21:20 53:11
90:13 164:16	115:20 135:8	individual 175:2	208:11	79:14 115:8
170:18 266:11	136:16 142:5	188:12 271:13	inheritable	186:3 283:22
improbability	147:5 187:22	272:8 277:14	149:4	intellectually
172:5	228:11 236:12	277:15	inheritance	249:5
improbable	286:18 290:19	individuals	145:2,11,16	intelligence 48:5
172:10	incomprehens...	148:9 149:3	153:2,4	55:7 58:16,17
improper 83:8	268:5	279:7 282:21	inherited 275:10	58:22 65:17

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

322

280:19 281:21 irremediably 175:14 Islamic 250:17 isolated 147:20 185:22 isolates 73:21 issue 14:22 15:7 15:12 28:4 36:17 57:5 70:17 99:7 158:19,20 167:10 184:21 192:1 208:8,11 223:17,20,21 245:14 288:20 issues 14:10 18:9 22:15 39:5 72:3 150:14,18 181:16 224:10 259:18 issuing 30:16 Italian 148:19 italicized 250:1 item 66:6 156:11 I-A-N 18:8	293:7 294:3 Johnson 214:7 245:7 Johnson's 246:2 joint 43:5 jointly 16:22 43:2 Jonathan 149:20 Jones 1:8 judge 1:8 5:19 24:22 134:16 judging 142:3 judgment 142:13,15 Julian 18:14 jump 155:22 170:21 231:14 jumping 87:6 junctures 93:5 June 1:15 295:14,16 just 5:11,21 11:18 12:2 13:15 16:6 25:9 32:18 33:21 38:3 56:1 67:12 70:2 71:15 72:6 81:6,9 94:17 100:2 108:2,19 112:19 113:10 113:20,20,21 114:20 121:8 126:2 130:2,13 136:14 137:1 156:8 157:4 159:9 162:14 164:10,20 165:14,16 174:21 178:8 180:15 182:14 182:15 183:3 183:19,22	184:3,6,9 185:22 189:6 189:13 194:6 201:13 204:7 206:9,21 207:12 218:1,5 227:4,5 235:16 239:3,4 243:3 245:21 251:22 253:13 256:12 268:5,14,19 270:11 271:17 272:2 273:5,6 276:17 279:12 280:5 286:5 justification 22:3 justified 64:13 202:21 203:16 203:17,18 204:11 juxtapose 254:20  K Karl 261:3 Kauffman 107:18 keep 77:13 125:4 142:10 151:1 168:9 188:7 198:22 200:7 225:18 235:14 keeping 163:20 183:2 243:9 280:14 keeps 141:14 180:22 Ken 157:12 158:2 197:15 197:19,20 222:13 224:11 262:18 Kenneth 26:17	kept 168:21 kids 263:12 kind 7:5 27:21 50:4 56:11 58:18 59:1,16 71:6 73:20,22 74:2 82:1,15 93:1 94:18 99:5 103:15 105:13 111:9 112:16 115:8 117:20 120:11 120:11 122:3 131:1 137:4,21 138:12,15 139:15 153:8 154:3 162:20 165:3,22 166:3 169:7 176:18 177:22 184:18 186:13 195:19 197:6,11 206:13 208:16 216:6 221:4 226:21 246:2 246:16 247:18 248:8 250:14 253:12 271:15 277:2 279:8 283:16,18 289:9 kinds 17:17 50:12 56:3 58:3 61:17 104:19 117:8 128:7 129:2 166:10 227:12 289:6,8 Kitzmiller 1:4 24:11 296:2 297:2 knew 27:7 153:3 know 5:7 10:7 13:6 18:16 27:9 32:15	37:22 42:21 56:4 57:19,20 69:14 70:9,10 74:14,17 76:10 80:19 93:22 102:1 105:21 112:17 117:12 119:4,9 123:18 124:17,21,22 130:13 131:16 131:16 133:6 134:5 135:14 136:12 140:3 140:15 154:9 162:4 163:20 168:15 169:22 176:22 179:9 180:9,11 182:8 185:10,11 191:20 192:3 197:1,6,10,13 209:18 215:17 218:11 223:3 225:6 235:10 235:10 236:5,6 239:14,17 241:2 245:16 248:15 255:9 256:11 259:11 264:10 266:5,6 267:14,19 273:22 278:1 282:19 283:18 284:20 288:10 288:14 289:19 knowable 96:6 130:11,11 192:8 279:19 280:21 knowing 56:12 213:22 knowledge 40:2 42:5 55:20 56:7,10,11,14 105:22 116:21
--	--	--	--	---



DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

323

198:17 216:4 236:12,13,15 241:11 <b>known</b> 67:7 70:8 73:1 95:1 101:16 117:6 130:22 131:10 213:3 264:3 <b>knows</b> 70:8,12 70:20	204:11 <b>laws</b> 94:19 137:10,19 140:5,11,12,18 203:21 286:10 286:10 <b>lawsuit</b> 8:8 11:10 32:7 <b>lawyer</b> 6:19,21 13:7 <b>lawyers</b> 150:14 193:16 <b>lay</b> 72:17 <b>layered</b> 154:14 156:8 <b>lays</b> 72:18 <b>lead</b> 23:9 119:5 122:18 216:7 239:12 246:5 265:9,9 <b>leads</b> 60:1 129:11 158:9 241:17,19 <b>leap</b> 172:4 <b>leaps</b> 148:16 <b>learn</b> 110:22,22 111:8,14 183:9 205:1 241:3 244:21 256:10 <b>learned</b> 130:19 130:20 131:2,3 131:4,6,13 273:14 <b>learning</b> 50:14 88:16 116:4 230:8 236:10 241:11 266:12 273:8 <b>learns</b> 273:13 <b>least</b> 48:7 65:8 90:13 107:20 125:20 129:18 135:6 136:4 146:9 156:19 179:9 196:22	197:4 198:10 210:21 211:13 274:14 <b>leave</b> 57:22 58:15 96:20 100:6 116:1,9 125:20 154:12 164:4 178:13 181:17 <b>leaves</b> 55:5 58:2 74:1 90:20 117:22 125:19 174:11 177:10 188:11 <b>leaving</b> 67:14 112:21 223:9 <b>lecturer</b> 12:1 <b>lectures</b> 15:3 <b>led</b> 18:21 53:8 82:1 228:16 <b>left</b> 30:14,17,19 34:20 58:12 91:13 105:16 143:15 203:4 256:13 <b>legal</b> 29:14,15 29:16 <b>legendary</b> 286:16 <b>legitimate</b> 59:15 172:7 187:12 190:5 211:21 216:2 <b>legitimately</b> 74:9 193:2 <b>legitimizing</b> 76:21 <b>legitimation</b> 265:12 <b>Lemaitre</b> 229:13 <b>Lemaitre's</b> 232:14 <b>lenient</b> 6:17 <b>less</b> 15:15 53:14	199:9 216:9 <b>let</b> 65:14 81:6 87:15,15,20,21 88:4 89:16 97:2 118:10,13 138:9 142:2 146:13 184:20 236:8 249:15 252:3 <b>lets</b> 137:20 <b>letters</b> 171:3 <b>letting</b> 207:10 <b>let's</b> 32:18 57:7 57:7 59:5 61:11,11,12,13 74:18 103:16 106:13 112:16 112:16,20 117:19 170:20 171:10,10,11 173:21 196:20 214:6,6 221:3 260:9 265:9 272:19 <b>level</b> 55:4 58:18 58:20 74:3 80:17,20,22 81:4,5,7,7,14 81:16 82:12,13 82:14 97:19,21 98:17 99:2,5 120:12,12,16 154:1 171:13 176:4 186:9,10 187:11 190:2 190:10 196:3 199:7 207:7,9 225:5 241:20 242:8,13 243:15,18 261:18,19 262:4 267:18 267:19 <b>levels</b> 73:17 80:16 81:11,12	94:4 96:20 99:8,15 105:9 151:10 185:4 187:8 188:1 189:22 206:15 240:10 284:8 284:13 287:3 <b>liberal</b> 248:8 <b>liberated</b> 178:3 <b>liberating</b> 286:17 287:2 287:21 <b>liberator</b> 288:1 <b>Liberties</b> 13:18 <b>library</b> 256:8,9 <b>lies</b> 76:15 193:4 <b>life</b> 20:18 21:20 58:4 65:9 91:6 91:14,18 96:13 96:16,21,22 97:1,15,16,21 98:2,3,6 101:22 104:13 104:15 127:8 135:18 139:9 147:7 151:4 152:4 153:18 154:6,11,15,18 162:3 170:15 170:17 174:10 175:4 176:14 178:21 187:1 188:12 190:7 207:11,16 210:20 213:14 224:21 237:16 239:16 242:4,5 242:15 248:20 254:17 255:18 269:3 <b>lifetime</b> 20:14 273:14 290:5 <b>light</b> 183:21 200:6 228:14 <b>like</b> 5:8,21 9:10
--	--	---	---	--

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

324

22:2 24:1	277:10	253:14	108:5,14	274:2,3 276:9
39:21 49:7	literally 132:11	Loneragan	121:18 157:14	277:12,17,18
52:22 61:10	132:20 158:2	118:18	185:10 193:5	277:21
62:19,20 66:7	164:14 165:12	long 12:13 15:11	207:22 211:1	main 39:3
77:8 81:16	184:12 275:6	30:21 60:15	227:6 259:4,10	110:14 132:12
87:10 88:20	277:22	94:12 102:14	274:8 278:13	208:8,10
90:13 93:6	literature	128:14 148:15	278:14	209:19
102:13 112:16	271:11 278:21	225:7 227:13	lots 52:1 61:15	mainstream
115:18 125:10	279:6 281:1	227:13 265:18	103:8 210:4	20:11
128:16 140:19	282:19	267:21 292:13	223:6 256:7	maintained
148:16 149:16	little 6:17 23:7	292:13,13	Louisiana 38:3	186:17
152:6 157:3	175:17 204:7	longer 51:9	38:8	maintaining
158:3 164:20	229:2 252:3	156:14	love 70:21 98:8	190:20
166:10 180:4	271:10	look 24:7 31:22	99:1	major 19:16
182:12 185:9	liturgy 179:11	32:6,9,11,16	loving 68:20	118:17 210:2
215:14 226:20	179:12	33:4 65:6	lowest 94:4	majority 58:10
227:4,18,20	live 231:4	73:13 85:1,7	lunch 131:18,20	110:16 247:6
231:14 233:3	lived 286:2	93:14 102:22	131:21	make 23:11
235:10 241:21	lives 49:10 63:7	103:5 122:19		24:22 30:13
254:15 259:8	176:15 179:1,3	123:20 128:22	<b>M</b>	39:11 48:16
261:3 273:12	272:15 284:22	151:10 167:21	machine 82:8	55:9 65:14
274:18 276:22	289:22 290:7	178:22 231:19	85:11 168:5	67:15 72:12
277:5 278:8	living 67:22	234:15 266:9	machines	73:13,18 76:3
282:8 287:14	68:5 91:13	275:18 279:9	171:19	85:19 124:4
288:10,14	103:18,19	280:9 287:17	machine-like	129:18 142:6
liked 221:16	104:20 136:15	looked 51:18	167:22 168:2	160:1 171:4
likewise 95:21	137:3 151:5,16	73:9 85:4	made 9:12 17:5	172:3,8 176:15
97:15	152:8 154:2	128:6 169:1	33:12 34:21	178:13 181:12
limit 61:3	174:12 237:13	looking 22:20	35:20 38:3	195:5 202:10
limited 222:9	242:7	62:15 64:17	46:5 49:2	205:5 206:12
limiting 192:6,7	Lloyd 3:15	66:7 73:16	52:10 73:10,13	207:1,4 208:22
Linde 227:19	LLP 2:4 3:5	82:6,21,22	74:4,9 90:5	209:7 219:13
line 176:7 222:4	local 196:1	83:13,14,16,17	199:12 205:12	221:4 224:21
270:6 296:7	259:15,18,22	84:5,17,22	209:5,10	234:2 236:19
297:7	Logan 3:6	86:21 112:14	212:14 232:19	237:20 241:10
lines 199:8	logic 143:17	112:15 113:1	235:12,13	244:11 247:7
202:13 229:1	logical 99:20	124:14 127:2	248:19 249:4,4	252:3 254:10
list 19:14 39:11	122:11 143:16	153:17 162:20	254:10 259:11	262:19 267:21
146:11 261:1	156:2,13 186:3	194:12 217:14	276:4	268:21 269:5
listed 38:22	190:16 207:11	240:3 254:16	magical 148:14	270:15,18
literalist 132:12	253:13	277:2	magisterial	272:17 275:9
272:3 276:7,13	logically 143:10	loose 166:3	273:12	277:9,10 279:2
277:2 282:9	144:2,9,10	lost 222:3	magisterium	285:16
283:12,16	174:2 185:2	lot 41:3 90:17	83:16 272:19	maker 269:11
literalists	192:18 205:13	101:18 107:18	273:5,6,11	269:14 270:5

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
 CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

325

<b>makes</b> 54:10	150:16 157:5,8	153:11 172:2	<b>mature</b> 80:7	257:4 267:6
142:12 160:10	157:8 158:17	221:9	206:11	268:12 269:21
234:12 237:20	162:5 171:1,7	<b>materialism</b>	<b>may</b> 6:14 12:5	270:16,18,20
261:13	171:7 178:14	60:1 62:5,8	41:5 56:19	273:3 277:18
<b>making</b> 14:2	180:10 181:20	63:21,21	86:9 118:14	277:19 281:22
54:6,13 59:1	199:6 208:21	108:21 162:14	121:19,20	286:20,20
77:17 79:18	209:16 212:18	162:15,18	124:13 143:9	289:16
82:14 83:8	226:19,19	202:15 215:6	143:11 144:1,3	<b>meaning</b> 5:14
86:22 87:5	227:2,2,12	273:19	148:1 162:21	55:6 58:4
163:12 175:22	228:1,7,9,10	<b>materialist</b> 18:4	173:21 195:19	71:13 72:8
179:2 192:5,8	237:9 239:18	62:8 186:17	206:1,2 214:21	124:19 222:7
277:1 280:8	241:15 248:22	201:12 214:11	<b>maybe</b> 34:7	272:6,7 292:6
288:17,17	251:8 253:6	228:10 244:2	138:5,6 180:20	<b>meaningful</b>
289:5	255:16,17	244:17 249:12	197:19 219:21	276:20
<b>maldistribution</b>	257:16,16,16	<b>materialists</b>	241:17 247:4	<b>meanings</b> 80:11
275:19	258:5,11,14,15	155:21 246:12	248:11 252:13	287:18 288:6
<b>mammalian</b>	258:16 259:15	247:3	266:12 272:17	<b>means</b> 44:12
152:2	259:19 262:8,8	<b>mathematical</b>	<b>Mayr</b> 145:20	55:20 148:12
<b>man</b> 39:21 54:8	262:11,17,18	89:19 109:13	146:3,4,5,6	157:19 162:18
257:18 270:19	263:11 267:2	116:16,16	147:11	169:9 190:11
271:7,22 273:1	268:19 278:7	129:5 171:15	<b>mean</b> 16:14	239:20 242:17
273:1 274:15	280:12,12	171:17 216:13	39:17 46:3	256:18 257:2,3
281:9 290:5	284:13 290:17	<b>mathematically</b>	54:5 58:8	262:17 268:22
<b>mankind</b> 271:15	290:17	89:13 116:13	59:13 68:9,16	269:19 270:21
271:22	<b>man's</b> 290:5	<b>mathematician</b>	69:22 82:12	271:4,14,14
<b>manner</b> 62:16	<b>man-made</b>	42:14 43:10	91:3 103:10	273:4 282:14
279:8	113:15,16	89:20 232:2	112:2,12,14	<b>meant</b> 8:19
<b>manufacture</b>	<b>mapped</b> 97:13	<b>mathematicians</b>	114:6 118:10	86:10 137:15
47:10	98:10	170:10	119:14 120:17	175:12 184:12
<b>manuscript</b> 22:3	<b>March</b> 33:17	<b>mathematics</b>	127:2 130:16	236:17
22:4	<b>mark</b> 32:18,19	40:6 90:11,13	138:6 139:17	<b>measure</b> 167:4
<b>many</b> 15:3,17,18	<b>marked</b> 9:11,15	127:12 232:3	139:18 153:14	230:22
26:17 34:6	24:2,4 32:21	239:21	156:18,18	<b>measuring</b>
41:20 48:19	<b>marriage</b> 10:12	<b>Matt</b> 164:8	157:14 161:11	231:3
51:22,22 52:10	<b>married</b> 10:10	165:10	161:12 164:6	<b>mechanism</b>
52:22 65:8,9	10:11	<b>matter</b> 38:16	164:14 165:12	47:18 50:5
66:9 67:6 69:8	<b>mass</b> 166:16	39:19 50:10	167:11 168:13	151:16 153:10
71:4,6 101:6	284:1	60:2 73:9,10	173:18 186:13	210:6,10
104:8 110:8	<b>master</b> 240:22	96:17 154:1	196:11 201:6	<b>mechanisms</b>
115:19,20	<b>mater</b> 162:17	162:11,15,16	203:5 209:15	46:14 66:12
122:16 126:18	<b>material</b> 28:11	162:17,17,22	215:7 217:18	67:21 145:12
128:15 133:16	33:12 44:9	163:22 175:18	218:16 225:20	145:13 148:1
133:22 135:7	52:4 55:8	175:22 205:6	225:21 226:6	<b>media</b> 136:21
140:7,13,13	100:9 105:13	229:5 238:12	234:18 236:4	231:8
144:20,20	107:15,19	<b>matters</b> 46:20	240:2,8 244:1	<b>medication</b> 7:5

DEPOSITION OF JOHN F. HAUGHT, PH.D.  
CONDUCTED ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 1, 2005

326

medieval 70:12	metabolism	methodologic...	120:14,14	misconstrue
meet 38:2	104:18	58:12 61:19	122:14 135:14	173:5
meetings 179:13	Metanexus	62:7,11,12	159:8 167:19	misinformed
member 40:14	259:20	73:1 86:18	180:21 182:8	274:5
40:16,20 41:1	metaphor 88:8	117:22 164:4	187:16 206:6	misread 244:1
197:7 259:20	267:2	methods 50:13	206:18 214:17	miss 113:22
260:4	metaphoric	114:2 117:4	240:9 255:12	203:7 275:5
members 35:2	108:15 127:5	236:11 239:20	290:15	281:5
188:16 196:9	metaphorical	266:6	Miller 157:12	missing 103:3
196:18 197:1,4	165:4	Meyer 191:19	158:3 197:20	mistaken 239:4
memory 18:14	metaphorically	Meyer's 145:20	262:18	misunderstan...
men 219:6	164:14	Michael 23:4	Miller's 26:17	184:18
Mendel 153:4	metaphors	35:22 42:10	197:16,19	misunderstan...
mentality	267:3	43:12 45:8	222:13 224:11	23:9
237:19 283:12	metaphysical	59:6 62:19	million 93:11	misunderstood
mention 16:18	65:22 66:11,16	67:9,9 76:7	94:12,17 101:7	112:9
21:17 149:22	67:13,18 68:1	82:6,16 106:7	152:1	mixing 53:6
236:19 243:3	68:6,8 81:5,5	149:16,22	millions 140:13	254:18
266:10	172:18,19	150:1 168:21	171:7 258:10	Moby 80:3
mentioned	190:15,15	179:19 195:3	mind 110:3	mode 62:1 73:6
16:14,20 17:9	metaphysics	208:17,22	111:2 112:4	127:6 128:19
19:11 23:13	156:14 186:9	214:7 215:20	113:19 127:19	254:21
54:2 91:16	meteorite	220:18 245:5,7	142:3,5,5	modern 18:19
109:21 148:2	151:22	247:20	151:1 160:3	55:20 115:22
202:20 211:20	method 42:19	Michigan 3:17	163:20 164:1,7	116:14 133:7
223:4,5 224:15	50:15 54:17	microbiology	168:9 183:2	152:21 153:1
238:8 243:1	55:2,5 57:21	39:13	188:2,7 200:7	221:19 222:5
262:10 263:5	58:2,14 59:17	microorganis...	227:4 235:14	modification
265:5 266:5	59:18,19 60:6	147:6	238:10 246:17	90:20 200:6
274:2	60:9,16,17	microscope	280:14 281:21	modifications
mentioning	61:4,10 62:17	39:22 64:1	284:21 286:12	106:4
16:17 242:20	62:20 77:21	73:8 83:18	minds 78:8	modify 190:8
266:15	86:18 87:3,6	84:6	109:7 111:6	molecular 98:13
mentions 255:19	100:12,13	microwave	207:15 251:21	98:18 126:4
men's 285:10	109:6 110:21	231:1	mind-like	167:21 171:19
Mere 170:3	114:6,7 117:5	middle 1:2	163:10	172:10 178:9
merely 86:5	117:8 118:9	24:11 70:14	mine 160:17	187:6 242:9
242:20 265:5	120:14 125:5	112:8 115:13	minority 121:9	molecule 169:7
266:15	164:10 173:9	115:17 217:19	258:4	169:10
mess 272:12	193:3 195:2	221:18,21,22	minute 46:12,16	molecules 97:6
message 126:6	197:2 200:4	249:18	73:21 204:8	97:6
238:9,11	208:4,5 222:6	might 7:17	minutia 73:16	Molinists 70:15
messed 275:14	methodological	28:14 67:11	miracles 286:8	moment 23:15
met 5:7 38:2	56:17 62:4	93:17 95:19	miraculous	32:5 50:18
42:22	80:15	104:10 109:2	148:14 168:19	75:15 129:17